

The Office of this JOURNAL and of the WEEKLY REPORTER is now at 12, Cook's-court, Carey-street, W.C.

The Subscription to the SOLICITORS' JOURNAL is—*Toten*, 26s.; *Country* 28s.; with the WEEKLY REPORTER, 52s. Payment in advance includes Double Numbers and Postage. Subscribers can have their Volumes bound at the Office—cloth, 2s. 6d.; half law calf, 5s.

All Letters intended for publication in the "Solicitors' Journal" must be authenticated by the name of the writer, though not necessarily for publication.

Where difficulty is experienced in procuring the Journal with regularity in the Provinces, it is requested that application be made direct to the Publisher.

The Solicitors' Journal.

LONDON, JULY 12, 1873.

THE DECISION of the Master of the Rolls in *Lacey v. Hill*, Scrimgeour's claim, has recently been affirmed by the Lords Justices. The facts of the case are sufficiently simple. Previously to the 14th July, 1870, Sir Robert Harvey had purchased, for speculating purposes, a considerable amount of Spanish and Italian stock, through his brokers, Messrs. Scrimgeour. This stock had been actually paid for by Messrs. Scrimgeour, out of money borrowed by them from their own bankers, on the security of the certificates of the stock. Sir Robert Harvey had not himself taken up the stock, but from time to time had directed Messrs. Scrimgeour to carry it over from one account-day to the next. On the 14th July, at Sir Robert's request, Messrs. Scrimgeour sold half of the stock and sent him an account, showing that he was liable to pay, and asking payment for, a difference of £16,000. On the 15th July Sir Robert shot himself at his house near Norwich, but he did not die until the 19th. The common belief was, and for this there seemed to be very good reasons, that he was insolvent at the time when he shot himself. Under this belief Messrs. Scrimgeour did not wait until the next account-day, viz., the 28th of July, but on the 16th, 18th, and 19th of July, sold the remainder of the stock without any direction to that effect from Sir Robert or any person on his behalf. At this time the market had fallen owing to the declaration of war by France against Prussia, and the difference of £16,000 was accordingly increased to £26,346. There was evidence showing that the market continued to fall until the 28th, so that if the stock had been kept until that day there would have been a further loss on it. Under these circumstances Messrs. Scrimgeour claimed the £26,346 in the suit of *Lacey v. Hill*, which was for the administration of Sir R. Harvey's estate. The claim was resisted, on the ground that the brokers ought not to have sold the stock, and it was contended that the amount which they were really entitled to claim was £16,000, the sum which their last account to Sir Robert showed to be due on the 14th July.

The Master of the Rolls said that, the brokers having received news immediately after they had applied for the £16,000 that their customer could not pay a farthing, and that he would probably die, he was of opinion, not only that the brokers were entitled to sell the stock for the most they could get for it, but that it was their duty to do so. His Lordship was further of opinion that not only was it their duty to do so on the ordinary principles of common sense, but that it was proved that this was the practice of the Stock Exchange on such occasions. In their judgments on the appeal both the Lords Justices drew attention to the fact that the stock had been bought and paid for; but notwithstanding this circumstance they seem to have treated it as clear that, if the unfortunate events which happened had not occurred, and if Sir Robert had made default on the next account-day, the brokers would have been justified in selling upon such default. This view

involves the construction of the letter of the 14th July as implying an undertaking to carry over the unsold stock to the next account-day. Lord Justice James is reported to have said that in the ordinary course of things the brokers would have kept the account open till the 28th of July; but circumstances occurred which induced them to act differently; and if this was a violation of their understanding with their principal, and if it had resulted in any loss to him, that might have been a very good ground of set off to their claim, but no such case was suggested here. Lord Justice Mellish is reported to have said that if brokers sold wheat or cotton which they had bought for a principal a fortnight sooner than the principal had ordered them to sell they would still be entitled to recover what they had laid out for him, and he would have a counter-claim against them for any loss which had resulted to him through their having sold too soon. This seems to imply that a direction to carry over until the next account-day is equivalent to a direction to sell on that day, which does not seem to us to be quite the case.

As has been already observed the case was one in which the stock had been actually bought and paid for. There occurred, however, *dicta* in the judgment of one of the Lords Justices to the effect that it appeared a reasonable rule in ordinary transactions that on the insolvency of a principal his broker may make fresh contracts, so as to lessen his own liability. Neither the decision, however, nor the *dicta* seem to us to warrant any such broad conclusion as that when it appears certain that a principal will be unable to meet his engagements at the next account-day, his broker is entitled *ipso facto* to peremptorily close his accounts at the market price at the time when the approaching default of the principal seems certain. Whatever the broker does, he does at his own risk. All that can be deduced from the decision is, that if no damage accrues to the principal or his estate from the assumption made by the broker that when the next account-day arrives his principal will be unable to complete, and from his acting on that assumption and selling at once, then the broker can claim all the moneys expended by him in the transaction.

A JUDGMENT OF GREAT IMPORTANCE to all persons interested in marine insurance has been delivered in the case of *Fisher v. The Liverpool Marine Insurance Company*. The "slip," or short memorandum of the policy which is initiated by the underwriter before the issue of the regular policy, no doubt, in practice, embodies the real contract of insurance, and the underwriter considers himself bound by its terms. But for want of a stamp it cannot be enforced as a contract. Under the old stamp laws it could not even be given in evidence for any purpose whatever. The present law, however, contained in 30 Vict. c. 23, has no such provision, and the effect of recent cases (*Ionides v. The Pacific Insurance Company*, L. R. 6 Q. B. 674, 20 W. R. C. L. Dig. 80, affirmed in the Exchequer Chamber, L. R. 7 Q. B. 517, 20 W. R. C. L. Dig. 81; *Cory v. Patton* (20 W. R. 364, L. R. 7 Q. B. 304), is that a slip, though not enforceable at law or in equity, as being an unstamped contract of insurance, may still be given in evidence wherever, though not valid, it is material.

In the late case, the plaintiff having taken advantage of this state of the law to show from the slip what the contract between him and the underwriting company really was, endeavoured to put himself and the company in the same position, so far as compensation went, as if the terms of the slip had been embodied in a duly stamped policy. The defendant company had initiated a slip, and were paid by the plaintiff both the premium and the price of the stamp. The usage of trade with companies is for the company to issue the stamped policy, differing from that of private underwriters at Lloyd's, to whom the broker of the assured presents the policy for signature. The

defendant company, however, was wound up, and the vessel having been lost, they declined to issue a stamped policy, though they were willing to return the premium and stamp money. The question was whether, in any form of action, the plaintiff could recover against the insurance company for the loss. Blackburn, J., held that, by receiving the stamp money, the company were placed in the same position towards the assured as a broker who has been employed to effect an insurance with a private underwriter. Such a broker would clearly be liable to an action by his principal if he neglected to procure a stamped policy, and the measure of damages would probably be the subject-matter of insurance which he had allowed to be lost, uncovered by insurance. The majority of the Court did not accede to this view; and, indeed, it is tolerably clear that if it had been taken, the result in many cases would have been to open a way to the evasion of the express provision prohibiting the enforcement of an unstamped contract of insurance. A company knowing that, after receipt by itself of the stamp duty, it would have to make the loss good, would do so without going through the form of executing a stamped policy.

The case is certainly a hard one; for the person upon whom the stamp law presses—viz., the plaintiff—has paid the stamp money in the belief that it will be at once applied to its proper purpose, whilst the person who has failed to pay over the stamp money which he has received, takes advantage of the non-payment for his own purposes. Of course in ordinary cases the loss of credit entailed upon the underwriter effectually prevents such proceedings. But the present case points to the danger of trusting too implicitly to the "slip," when, from the insolvency of the underwriter, or for some other reason, strict rights may come to be enforced, and reliance may have to be placed upon technical defences.

WE CANNOT CONGRATULATE the Irish Bar on the judgment shown in the selection of their most recent grievance. An inquiry was lately instituted in Ireland, into the circumstances attending the loss of a vessel, and Mr. Hamel, the chief solicitor to the Board of Trade, who is a member of the English Bar, was sent down to conduct the investigation. His appearance before an Irish magistrate called forth a protest from Mr. Corrigan, one of the counsel engaged in the case. "Since the commencement of the present inquiry," said the learned gentleman, "and also on the occasion of two recent inquiries of a similar kind, much conversation had taken place amongst members of both the senior and junior Bar in reference" to the matter. "The members of the Irish Bar felt naturally aggrieved at an English barrister coming over here, and, in fact, taking the place of an Irish barrister. . . . At a similar inquiry in England an Irish barrister would certainly not be allowed to attend." Now, as the magistrate remarked, although Mr. Hamel was an English barrister, he attended the inquiry not in that capacity, but as an officer of the Board of Trade; and it so happened that a precedent existed of the appearance of an Irish barrister at precisely similar inquiries in England. Mr. O'Dowd, the well-known assistant solicitor of the Board of Trade, is, it appears, a member of the Irish bar, and, as Mr. Hamel remarked, had for many years conducted inquiries of the kind in question all over England and Scotland, and on no occasion had his right to act been even questioned by the English bar. This was rather disheartening for Mr. Corrigan; but he consoled himself by remarking that "the Board of Trade should have English barristers for English inquiries, and Irish barristers for inquiries in Ireland." But if the Board of Trade find it more convenient to send an officer who happens to be an Irish barrister to conduct English inquiries, and an officer who happens to be an English barrister to conduct Irish inquiries, is there any grievous wrong done to the Irish bar?

IN DELIVERING JUDGMENT in the case of *Ex parte Thorne, In re Butlin*, reported in last week's *Weekly Reporter* (p. 763), Mellish, L.J., said it was difficult to see why both the words "filing" and "registration" should have been used in the 275th Bankruptcy Rule, and his Lordship expressed an opinion that one of these expressions would seem to be superfluous. A correspondent, who is entitled to speak with authority, points out that neither judges nor counsel appear to have remembered that whereas in liquidation cases (section 125) the resolution is perfected at one meeting, in composition cases (section 126) there must be two meetings; and the resolution come to at the first meeting is only inchoate until it has been confirmed at the second meeting. One of the main difficulties of the rules, continues our correspondent, was to roll the two sections 125 and 126 into one; so as to do what the statute apparently did not, viz., give facility to the creditors when they met to proceed as they thought fit, either under section 125 or section 126. The rules attempt to contemplate both liquidation and composition cases. In both the proper custody of the resolutions must be provided for, and opportunity given for signature by creditors, who, it is well-known—particularly in large cases—rush away from the room directly after a decision is come to on the mode of liquidation to be adopted. Now, assume a first meeting, and a resolution come to for a composition. The statute does not contemplate "registration" of such inchoate resolution, nor does it provide for its custody, therefore a rule (282) stepped in and required it to be "filed," and hence the use of the word "filing" in the rule referred to by the Lord Justice.

THE PROPOSITION of Mr. Hardy to transfer to the new tribunal of final appeal all appeals in ecclesiastical causes, was received last week in the House of Commons with a fervour which Mr. Gladstone justly described as "very remarkable." For once, Mr. Osborne Morgan and Mr. Beresford Hope were agreed, although the former gentleman, while announcing his approval of Mr. Hardy's amendment, could not resist a characteristic allusion to "the wide difference which existed between the ecclesiastical and judicial spirit." The result will be that no bishops will in future sit in the Supreme Court for ecclesiastical appeals. This change, however, is not revolutionary. It may better be described, though in no invidious sense, as reactionary. The Church Discipline Act (3 & 4 Vict. c. 86) for the first time made the presence of a prelate *a sine qua non* upon the hearing by the Judicial Committee of an appeal from the provincial courts of Canterbury and York. Previous to the transfer of the authority of the old Court of Delegates to the Privy Council, the presence of a clerical element in the Court was the exception rather than the rule. That Court, we may remind our readers, was held under the 25 Hen. 8, c. 19, and consisted of *judices delegati* appointed under the great seal to hear ecclesiastical appeals as the occasion arose. The interesting return published some two years since by Mr. Reeve, shows that in a majority of cases all the delegates were laymen. Mr. Hardy's amendment, therefore, is merely a recurrence to the old practice; and a Court of Appeal consisting of trained laymen will certainly be at least as acceptable both to clergy and laity as the present Court. The party which is called the "Ritualistic" party has indeed shown by its actions that the Judicial Committee, even though leavened by a bishop or two, does not command its confidence. Every Sunday, in some scores, if not hundreds, of churches, the judgment in *Hebbert v. Purchas*, as to the position of the minister whilst celebrating the communion, is ostentatiously disregarded. The decisions of a Court recommended by Mr. Hardy and Mr. Beresford Hope may perhaps be treated more respectfully.

AMONG MINOR ALTERATIONS in the Judicature Bill we notice with regret that the Admiralty rule in damages

which the Bill abolished has been restored. From the scanty reports of this part of the debate we can only gather that the Attorney-General differed from the Lord Chancellor on this point, and that it was with his ready consent that the change in the Bill was made. It would be improper to compare the value of the two opinions thus opposed to one another; the reasons for them we have examined earlier (*ante* p. 437). Mr. Watkin Williams endeavoured to uphold the Common Law rule, which proceeds upon clear principle and good sense, against its rival, which (now that the original form of it has been lost) rests upon nothing better than indecision and confusion of thought; but although it may be fairly said that he was better qualified by practical experience than any other member who took part in the debate to pronounce an opinion on the point, his efforts were unavailing. Looked at from a juridical point of view, the Admiralty rule is ludicrous; but we suppose there is some point of view from which it appears captivating. What that point of view is we do not know, but we think it must be the point of view of people who cannot make up their minds.

THE PROVISIONS of the Judicature Bill relating to District Registries passed on Thursday night without a division, but not without able statements of the views which have been put forward on both sides of the question. The scope to be given to those provisions, if the Bill passes, will depend on the rules to be hereafter framed, and the assurance of the Solicitor-General that "no powers whatever were to be conferred on the District Registrars except under rules to be approved by the Lord-Chancellor, and a majority of the Judges, subject to the approval of Parliament," no doubt in no small degree tended to the ready acceptance of the provisions by the House. The full discussion of the subject in the debate, and the unexpectedly rapid decision which has been arrived at, appear to render unnecessary the publication of the observations of the Provincial Law Societies, to which we referred last week.

PARLIAMENTARY PRIVILEGE.

The chances, already almost desperate, of a successful issue of the Judicature Bill, have suddenly all but vanished before the utterly unexpected (and, we must add, not altogether reasonable) position assumed by the House of Lords. We say the House of Lords, because, although that House has not come to any formal resolution on the subject, it is obvious that any proposition in which Lord Cairns and Lord Salisbury concur, will, at any rate in the absence of strong pressure from without in a contrary direction, be adopted by the House if those noble Lords think it of sufficient importance to make a point of it. It is true that the course proposed by the Government to be taken in the House of Commons will probably deprive the Lords of the opportunity of relying upon the specific objection raised by Lord Cairns on Tuesday night, but it is impossible not to perceive that there is underlying this objection such substantial repugnance to the Bill itself, at least in its present form, as renders it highly unlikely that it will be permitted to become law this session; and this is, indeed, the element of unreasonableness to which we have referred. For, if their Lordships now repent of what they have done, and desire either to retrace their steps altogether, or, at any rate, to decline to carry out their present action to its logical consequence, they would have ample opportunity of effecting either object when they come to consider the Commons' amendments—some of which are obviously such that a persistent refusal to agree with them would secure the loss of the Bill—without going out of their way to raise an important constitutional question as a mere cloak for a different design. As, however, the question has been formally raised in the House of Lords, and the privilege claimed has been expressly disavowed in the House of Commons, it may be

worth while, notwithstanding the proposed withdrawal of the amendment objected to, to consider the character of the objection, and the nature of Parliamentary privilege generally. And here we may observe, in the first place, that a claim of any exclusive privilege, in matters of legislation, by either House of Parliament, is one which, however unreasonable or extravagant it may be, can never be successfully resisted by the other House, nor, indeed, except by armed violence, by any other authority whatever. For if the House claiming the privilege will only persistently refuse even to consider any Bill offending against the claim, there is no method of compelling them to depart from this position known to the Constitution. Such a claim, therefore, which, from its very nature, can neither be overridden or controlled, ought obviously to be most scrupulously guarded and sparingly used. Instead of this, however, the tendency of both Houses has always been towards the extension of their respective privileges, and the collective legislative capacity of Parliament has suffered, now in one direction, now in another, by the rivalry thus created between them. It is true that the House of Commons has ever been the greater offender in this respect; and perhaps the most outrageous abuse of "privilege" to be found in our history was the manner in which the repeal of the paper duties was effected, by inserting a clause for the purpose in a Bill of Supply.* But this consideration goes no further, as it seems to us, to justify the Lords in a similar course of aggression than persistent trespasses on the part of one of two adjoining landowners would justify the other in taking forcible possession of that which was unquestionably his neighbour's property.

That the Government have exercised a wise discretion in declining to commit the House of Commons to any contest on this occasion will be clear from what has been already said. For, as the only manner in which the claim could be resisted would be by the Commons persisting in passing Bills taking away the appellate jurisdiction in question, which the Lords would equally persistently refuse to consider, it is obvious that, unless there were thus aroused sufficient public opinion to coerce one or both Houses into a settlement of the question, the ultimate victory must be on the side of passive resistance, and all that the Commons would gain by their action would be to affirm the privilege claimed at the cost of an indefinite postponement of a very desirable reform.

The particular privilege claimed on this occasion is, in terms, unquestionable, but it is, we think, extremely doubtful whether the proposed amendments, which have been the excuse for its assertion, would, if actually carried into effect, have constituted any breach of the privilege at all. The principle that each House is the sole guardian of its own liberties and authorities, and that any action of the other House in any way prejudicially affecting such liberties or authorities is a breach of privilege, has been well established long since, though it cannot be said to have been always unquestioned; but whether any particular act, or proposed act, comes within the rule is a question of fact, always more or less difficult of determination, and not the less so because the House whose action is complained of is always sure to protest that no breach of privilege has been committed.

Again, there is necessarily great difficulty in de-

* The present privilege of the House of Commons in respect of "Money bills" is a remarkable instance of unreasonable extension of a perfectly reasonable privilege; an extension effected, and which could only have been effected, by the exercise of such obstinacy on the part of the Commons as already pointed out. It appears from the Parliamentary records exhumed by Mr. Hallam that the original privilege of the Commons in respect of money bills was merely this, that the time for which any duties were granted could not be increased by the Lords. Now it is well established that the Lords cannot even amend a clerical error in a "money bill," though they still have a right, if they choose to take the responsibility of doing so, to throw it out altogether; but so far was this from being an original privilege of the Commons, that the Lords had a right to reduce the duration of the tax without even sending the Bill back to ask for the acquiescence of the Commons.

termining the precise effect to be given to precedents, because the only case in which a precedent can be relied on as authority is not likely to occur, and has, in fact, seldom or never occurred. If it can be shown that on any occasion a particular claim was made, and that that claim was successfully resisted, that would, we think, be an authority conclusive against the claim; but as the House claiming the privilege has it, as we have seen, completely within its own power to maintain it, at least in all ordinary cases, it is most improbable, almost impossible, that such cases should occur, and we are not aware of any instances in point except Sir John Fagg's case, in which the House of Commons contested the right of the Lords to entertain an appeal against a decree of the Court of Chancery pronounced in favour of one of their members.

If, indeed, the circumstances now complained of can be shown to have frequently passed without objection, a very strong presumption would arise that they are confessedly unobjectionable; but this presumption would be greatly weakened by any difference in the nature of the complaint, and would vanish altogether if the instances relied on were isolated or very few—more especially if, for any reason, it became unnecessary to raise the claim.

Further, no inference whatever, however slight, would arise from any proposed action of either House, if in the result the proposal was negatived by that House, and thus never came officially before the other. If, indeed, as in the present instance, the House which considered itself about to be aggrieved were to raise the objection by anticipation (in the nature of a proceeding *quia timet*), and the other House were, as is now proposed, so far to acquiesce in the objection as to withdraw the proposal, some faint, though very faint, inference in favour of the privilege, may arise; but if, on the other hand, they prefer to wait in silence till the Bill reaches them, and it is either rejected in the other House, or amended there so as to be unobjectionable, it is obvious that no inference prejudicial to the claim can arise from such silence. Lastly, no protest of the other House, to the effect that the matter complained of is properly unobjectionable, can be entitled to any weight whatever. Their concurrence in the claim without protest would be conclusive against them, but that, at least on the first occasion of any such claim, it would be ridiculous to expect: it could only take place if they had deliberately attempted that which they knew at the time to be wrong, a course not to be anticipated from either House of Parliament.

The precedents relied upon on the present occasion seem to show, that whatever may be the weight to be given to Blackstone's dictum, it cannot be accepted in its entirety. It is hardly possible to contend that the privileges of the Lords in respect of their jurisdiction and authority are more stringent than those of the Commons in the corresponding case, and, therefore, the proceedings upon the Reform Bills of 1832 and 1867, in both of which extensive amendments were made by the Lords, may, we think, be relied upon as establishing that no breach of privilege arises upon the mere fact of an amendment having been made (as would be the case in a money Bill) irrespective of the effect of the amendment. On the other hand, Lord Lyndhurst's successful protest in 1850 would tend to support an inference that any provision really affecting, though not prejudicially, the authority of the House, would be a breach of privilege. This is, however, a proposition so startlingly in excess not only of the general rule, but of the reason of that rule, that it seems, by its very extravagance, to detract from its own authority. Moreover, in that case, as in this, the Government of the day, while withdrawing the proposal objected to, maintained that there had been no breach of privilege. The Irish Church Act is an instance more in point, because in that case a Bill commenced in the Commons was sent to the Lords, containing a provision actually taking away the legislative rights of then existing peers, and was received without protest and returned without (in that respect) amendment. But the authority

of that instance is greatly weakened by the special circumstances of the case. The Bill was accepted by the Lords avowedly under coercion from public opinion, and as the only way in which the privilege could be asserted would have been by refusing to entertain the Bill at all, the same pressure which controlled their aversion to it on the merits, would operate to prevent them from raising a purely technical objection—as all such objections now are. The particular provision in respect of which alone privilege could have been claimed was struck out by the House of Lords in Committee, but re-inserted on the third reading, partly at the request of the very prelates affected by it, so that it is impossible to conjecture what might have been the result had that become the sole point of contention between the Houses. Had that case arisen, and had the Lords then given way, it would have gone as far as any single instance could do, to negative the claim now set up by Lord Cairns.

It is rather a pity that with so much to be fairly said against the claim of the Lords in this instance, so much stress should have been laid, both in and out of Parliament, on the argument that the particular authority said to be attacked rests on the authority of statute, and is not one of the ancient privileges of the Peers. As regards Ireland this is utterly absurd: the Irish House of Lords, at the Declaration of Independence, successfully vindicated their right to be the ultimate Court of Appeal from the Irish Courts; and all that the Act of Union did was to put the United House of Lords in the same position, as to privilege and otherwise, in which the Irish House had previously been. In the case of Scotland, there is a shadow (though but a shadow) of foundation for the argument. The original Court of Ultimate Appeal was the Parliament—which, in Scotland, sat as one Chamber; and the Act of Union in effect decided that that right which had previously belonged to the whole Parliament should for the future be vested exclusively in the Lords. But surely when so vested it vested with all its incidents, one of which was that it became entitled to the protection of privilege of peerage, to whatever extent that may properly go. As well might it be said that because the New South Wales Government Act prescribes that all money Bills must begin in the Lower House, a Bill for abolishing that privilege could properly be introduced into and passed by the Legislative Council.

It is true, as Archbishop Whateley has remarked, that a bad argument ought to go for nothing either way; nevertheless in fact it always tells against the side in support of which it is brought forward, and this makes us all the more regret that so utterly untenable an argument as this should have been assigned so prominent a place on the present occasion.

JUDICIAL UNCERTAINTY.

"When" (says Martin, B., in *Reg. v. Robinson*, L. R. 1 C. C. 80, 15 W. R. 966), "a point has once been distinctly raised and decided in a reported case, I, for my part, regret to find such a decision criticised and disputed over again. When a point has once been clearly decided, I think it is far better to acquiesce in the decision, unless it can be brought for review before a higher Court." We should have thought that all persons who valued certainty in law would have agreed with the learned judge in this opinion; but perhaps the last place where we should have reasonably expected to find agreement with it (though that may be the case where agreement is most desirable) would be where an opinion strongly prevails in one particular Court, which has been deliberately and repeatedly overruled; here we can scarcely expect not to hear from time to time some re-

* A conspicuous example of the petty absurdity of these claims is afforded by the "red letter" clauses of the present Bill, the only practical effect of which is to confuse the numbering of the sections by the omission and subsequent re-insertion of the provisions for salaries and pensions.

monstrance and protest; but we may expect to find the decisions of Courts of Appeal followed by the Courts of First Instance from which the appeal lay. Sir John Stuart was a judge very tenacious of his opinions and very frank in expressing them; yet, in *Knox v. Turner* (18 W. R. 276, L. R. 9 Eq. 155, affirmed, 18 W. R. 873, L. R. 5 Ch. 515), he acquiesced in the decision which compelled him to disregard the debtor's claim to the benefit of a policy effected by his secured creditor, although he consoled himself by a protest against what he regarded as an erroneous rule. We must assume that, as standing next in succession to Stuart, V.C., all the prerogatives of that branch of the Court, including the right of protest, have descended to Vice-Chancellor Malins; and when, in *Lewes' Trusts* (19 W. R. 195, L. R. 11 Eq. 236), we found that learned judge acquiescing in the overthrow of the rule on which he had formerly acted, and following the rule laid down by the Court of Appeal in *Re Phené's Trusts* (18 W. R. 303, L. R. 5 Ch. 139), we supposed that, in the remonstrance with which he accompanied his order, the whole of his opposition was exhausted. And, considering the decisive way in which the rule had been laid down in *Re Phené's Trusts*, as well as in the Court of Exchequer Chamber, and that the principle had been adopted in the Court of last resort (*Wing v. Angrave*, 8 H. L. C. 188), the course adopted by the learned judge on that occasion was such as we should have expected. We are the more surprised to find that, notwithstanding the affirmance on appeal of his decision in *Lewes' Trusts* (19 W. R. 617, L. R. 6 Ch. 356), in a case of *Westbrook's Trusts*, decided a few days ago by the Vice-Chancellor, the rule so clearly and expressly laid down has been (if the reports are to be trusted) in spirit, at least, again departed from. A sum of £700 had to be divided among the next of kin of a legatee, the payment of whose legacy had been deferred till the death of the testator's widow. The legatee had not been heard of since 1851. He was then at the gold diggings in California, whence he wrote a letter expressing his intention of coming home in a few months; but he was never afterwards heard of, and was supposed by his family to have perished in the floods there, in which about that time many persons lost their lives.

Now there was here actual evidence, consisting of the expressed intention to return shortly, coupled with the non-return, the cessation of correspondence, and the fatal floods, on which the Court might very reasonably have based the inference that the legatee had died shortly after he wrote the letter—evidence nearly, if not quite, as cogent as that on which the Vice-Chancellor acted in *Beasley's Trusts* (L. R. 7 Eq. 498, 17 W. R. Ch. Dig. 140). But if the positive evidence, which all pointed to death about the time when the deceased was last heard of, was disregarded, there only remained two possible periods; that time, taken because it was the last time that the deceased was known to be living, or seven years after, taken because it was then, for the first time, to be presumed that he was dead. It seems strange that, after the law has been so clearly laid down against the existence of a presumption of life until the end of seven years, the Court should deliberately shut its eyes to any circumstances whatever of positive evidence which would enable it to decide upon evidence, and not upon presumption, when the death in question really took place. But that is the course which Malins, V.C., appears to have pursued, for, not content with protesting anew against the exclusion of the presumption of continued existence during seven years where an affirmative title has to be made out, he determined that "here, where some date must be fixed, seven years would be the right period," and accordingly (as "the most convenient and proper form of decree") directed inquiries as to who were the next of kin of the legatee seven years after the date of his last letter." No doubt "some date must be fixed;" but ought it to be fixed by the best evidence there is, or by mere guess work? The nature of a presumption of law (as distinguished from one *de jure*) is that it affords a rule in the absence of all evidence; as

soon as evidence appears the presumption vanishes. The presumption here, however, is, as has been expressly laid down, not a presumption as to continued life for seven years, but a presumption at the end of seven years that life continues no longer; a presumption founded on the reasonable view, that so long a period as seven years is not likely to elapse during a man's life without some evidence of his existence becoming known to those with whom he is connected. That presumption leaves free room for all inferential evidence as to when the death occurred. To this presumption Malins, V.C., adds a new one, that the man died at the end of the seven years: a presumption which it would be ludicrous to found on the view that so long a period as seven years is not likely to elapse after a man's death without his friends having heard of the event; because if that were so, then *a fortiori* where (as here) his death has not been heard of for twenty-two years he must be presumed to be still alive; and which, therefore (if it is not to be inconsistent with the ground and reason of the established presumption) must be founded on the view that so long a period as seven years is not likely to elapse after a man's death without his friends becoming aware of his continued existence; and, for the sake of this presumption, the learned judge disregards evidence which goes to show that the man did in fact die at the beginning of that period.

RECENT DECISIONS.

EQUITY.

COSTS OF SUCCESSFUL APPEAL FROM COUNTY COURT.

Ashby v. Sedgwick, V. C. M. 21 W. R. 455, L. R. 15 Eq. 245.

Not very long ago we pointed out (16 S. J. 652) the great diversity which exists between the rules of the different tribunals of this country with respect to the costs of successful appeals. In the House of Lords and the Court of Chancery a successful appellant pays for his success; while in the Privy Council and the Courts of Common Law his costs fall on his antagonist. The Court of Bankruptcy has recently (*Re Cherry, Ex parte Matthews*, 19 W. R. 1005, L. R. 12 Eq. 596), with expressions of regret, felt itself bound to follow the rule in Chancery.

In the present case Malins, V.C., on an appeal from a County Court, declined to be guided by the rule in Chancery. Having regard to the smallness of the amounts in dispute, his Honour thought that it was of great importance, towards securing the right of appeal, that it should be understood that in general, where an appellant succeeds, he will have the costs of the appeal. The effect of this decision is to introduce one more anomaly into the existing confusion on the subject. We think the Vice-Chancellor is right so far as principle goes; and we congratulate him on his boldness in refusing to follow the rule of equity, which the Chief Judge felt unable to resist, though under far less cogent circumstances, as he was administering bankruptcy and not equity.

COMMON LAW.

CARRIERS—LIABILITY OF CONTRACTING COMPANY FOR NEGLIGENCE OF COMPANY WITH RUNNING POWERS.

Wright v. Midland Railway Company, Ex. 21 W. R. 460, L. R. 8 Ex. 137.

Upon the much controverted question involved in this case it is better to say nothing beyond this: that we cannot see how the present case is to be distinguished from the case of *Thomas v. Rhymney Railway Company* (19 W. R. 477, L. R. 6 Q. B. 266), in the Exchequer Chamber. The reasoning of the learned barons, and especially of Bramwell, B., is most able and forcible to show that the defendants ought not to be liable, but it seems equally forcible to show that the defendants ought not to have been liable in *Thomas v. Rhymney Railway*

Company. At least, we are unable to grasp the distinction. It is plain the question cannot be set at rest until it has been decided upon in a Court of last resort.

NOTES.

We regret to notice the withdrawal of the Trade Marks Registration Bill, which the Board of Trade brought in at a sufficiently early stage of the session to have enabled them to pass it through all its stages had they been so minded. As it is, although the Bill has been printed, it has not even been read a second time. We may presume that the Bill will reappear at the commencement of next session on account of the desire manifested by the Associated Chambers of Commerce to have such a measure placed upon the statute book, and the efforts of the Trade Mark Protection Society in the same direction. A select committee of the Associated Chambers of Commerce sat early in the year to consider the question of the Registration of Trade Marks, when a draft Bill to effectuate that object was submitted to them by the solicitor to the Trade Mark Protection Society. The knowledge that the society was ready with a Bill seems to have galvanised the Board of Trade into activity, and to have effected what previous pressure was unable to effect—viz, the inducing them to bring in a Bill; although, as we have shown, they were not very eager to pass it. Another Bill, which we also regret to see withdrawn, is the Building Societies Bill (No. 3), being the third brought in during the present session to amend the law relating to building societies. This Bill was intended to supersede Bills No. 1 and No. 2, dealing with building societies, the promoters of each of which refused to accept their opponents' measure. The result is that no Bill will pass this session dealing with the subject.

A correspondent draws attention to the following touting advertisement, which he has cut from last Saturday's *Standard* :—

TRADESMEN and all in **DIFFICULTIES** will do well to consult a respectable **SOLICITOR** of great experience at once. Release from all debts, &c., without publicity or bankruptcy, in the quickest way possible under the new Acts. Consultation free—**MR. CAMPBELL, 25, CROWN-STREET, W.C.** Divorce and all actions conducted with energy and confidence.

The Attorney-General's statement, that "the Court of Chancery was burdened with appeals in Bankruptcy," has called forth a letter from Mr. Registrar Keene, who says, "The facts are that in the Appeal Court before the Lords Justices there are two cases unheard; and I am informed this morning by Mr. Registrar Roobe that there are eleven cases only for hearing before the Chief Judge, all of which, most probably, would have been disposed of had not the time of the Court been recently occupied for five whole days in hearing one case."

In referring last week to the candidates for the office of Town Clerk of London we omitted to mention the name of Mr. Hugh Cowie.

GENERAL CORRESPONDENCE.

RE GRESHAM'S APPEAL.

Sir,—I enclose copy letter from me to Mr. Williamson and copy of his reply. As this is a matter affecting solicitors generally, I shall be obliged by your inserting the letters in your paper.

DALTON T. MILLER.

5 and 6, Sherborne-lane, London,
E.C., July 10, 1873.

(Copy.)

E. W. Williamson, Esq.,
Secretary Incorporated Law Society,
5 and 6, Sherborne-lane, E.C.,
27th June, 1873.

Re Inns of Court. Gresham's Appeal.

Dear Sir,—I see by the papers that Mr. Thomas Gresham's appeal from the decision of the benchers of Gray's Inn (striking him off the books of the society, on the ground that when he entered as a student he intended

to become an articled clerk, contravening the 7th clause of the Consolidated Regulations of the Inns of Court of Michaelmas, 1869) will be heard by the judges to-morrow.

As this appeal ought to test the right of the benchers to make regulations to the prejudice of solicitors, I shall be obliged by your informing me whether the Council of the Incorporated Law Society have taken into consideration the propriety of taking up Mr. Gresham's appeal on behalf of solicitors generally, instead of allowing Mr. Gresham to fight it at his own expense.

I think this is one of the cases the Council ought to fight out of the revenue of the society, to test whether the benchers have a right to make regulations without the sanction of Parliament, excluding attorneys from becoming students, and thus preventing them changing to the other branch of the profession.—Yours truly,

DALTON T. MILLER.

Incorporated Law Society, U.K., Chancery-lane,
London, W.C., 5th July, 1873.

Dear Sir.—Your letter of the 27th inst. was brought under the attention of the Council yesterday, when they met for the first time since its receipt.

The Council feel some difficulty in recommending the application of the funds of the society towards what might be considered an individual grievance, but they will not offer any opposition to a proposal, if made at the next general meeting, that Mr. Gresham be assisted at the society's cost.—I am, Dear Sir, yours faithfully,

E. W. WILLIAMSON, Secretary.

D. T. Miller, Esq., 5 and 6, Sherborne-lane.

APPRAISER'S OATH.

Sir,—In the article contained in last week's *Journal* headed "The Law of Distress for Rent," it is stated that a statute of last session enacted that in future no oath should be required from appraisers. I have searched for the statute, but without success. Will you in your next give the chapter and section, and oblige,

A SUBSCRIBER.

9th July, 1873.

[We are not surprised that our correspondent has not discovered the section to which we referred. It is embedded in an Act "to render unnecessary the general appointment of parish constables" (35 & 36 Vict. c. 92). The concluding clause of section 13, after providing that "so much of the statute 2 William and Mary, c. 5, as requires any sheriff or undersheriff or constable to be aiding or assisting at any distress for rent, or to swear any appraiser thereat shall be repealed," goes on to enact that "no oath shall after the day aforesaid be required from such appraiser."—*Ed. S. J.*]

APPOINTMENTS.

Mr. Serjeant WHEELER has been appointed Judge of Circuit No. 43 (Marylebone) in the place of Mr. H. J. Macnamara, who has been appointed one of the commissioners under the Railway and Canal Traffic Bill. The learned serjeant was called to the bar at the Middle Temple in Hilary Term, 1846, and was appointed judge of the county court at Liverpool, on 26th May, 1862.

Mr. L. W. CAVE, of the Midland Circuit, has been appointed Recorder of Lincoln, in succession to the late Serjeant O'Brien. Mr. Cave was called to the bar at the Inner Temple in Trinity Term, 1859.

Mr. H. BOOTH has been appointed Town Clerk of Oldham, in the place of Mr. John Ponsouby, resigned. Mr. Booth was previously junior partner in the firm of Messrs. J. & J. Hibbert, solicitors, Hyde and Manchester.

MR. WILLIAM HARDMAN MILLS, solicitor, of Bicester, Oxfordshire, has been appointed Clerk to the Bicester King's End Local Board of Health, in the place of Mr. F. H. Lindsey, deceased. Mr. Mills was admitted an attorney in Trinity Term, 1859.

Mr. DAVID THOMAS, solicitor, of Brecon, has been appointed, by Lord Tredegar, Lord-Lieutenant of the county of Brecon, to be Clerk of the Peace for that county, in the place of Mr. Edward Williams, who has resigned from advancing years and failing health, after having held the office for upwards of 26 years. Mr. Thomas was admitted an attorney in Hilary Term, 1833.

PARLIAMENT AND LEGISLATION.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

July 4.—*Judicial Life Peerages*.—Lord Redesdale moved an address to her Majesty, praying that her Majesty will sanction the erection of the offices of Lord High Chancellor, Lord Chief Justice of the Queen's Bench, Lord Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, and Lord Chief Baron of the Exchequer of England into Baronies, entitling the holders of those offices to writs of summons to Parliament making the persons receiving the same, although they may not continue to hold the said offices, peers of Parliament for life, without remainder to the heirs of their bodies. He argued that official peerages were no novelty, for the Church had from the earliest period been represented in the House in that way, and the Church being no more closely allied to the State than the law, it would be equally advantageous for the law also to be represented. After the charges preferred from the bench against Parliament of careless legislation, it might be an advantage to have the chief judges in the House, responsible in some degree for what was done.—Lord Granville said he would much prefer to life peerages attached to offices some restriction on the number of life peers at one time or on the annual creations. He had no doubt life peers would be an advantage to the House, but he thought the best way would be to leave the prerogative of the Crown undisturbed.—Lord Salisbury said that the change that appeared to be impending through the operation of the Judicature Bill would, he feared, tend largely to diminish the number of legal peers in the House, because lawyers of eminence would not have the same inducements as before to accept peerages, and the consequent result to the reputation of the House as a legislative assembly would be most injurious. This prospective evil might, however, in some degree be met by the noble lord's proposal being carried into effect.—After some observations by Lords Malmesbury and Lord Rosebury, Lord Cairns said he agreed with the motion to a great extent, so far as it went. He was at the same time unwilling to vote for it, because it only touched the mere fringe of the question, and in dealing simply with one point of it might create the impression that the rest ought not to be dealt with. He was therefore unable to vote for the motion, while he was prepared to consider the principle that some mode of introducing official persons, such as those named in it, into the House ought to be adopted. He, therefore, moved the previous question.—Lord Colchester supported the plan of an *ex officio* peerage as proposed.—The Lord Chancellor said he should be very glad to see persons holding the high offices named in the proposal under discussion occupying seats in that House, and he should, therefore, be very reluctant to vote against any motion having that object. But he was, on the other hand, very strongly impressed with the feeling that it would be wholly impossible to stop at so limited an extension as was proposed of peerages to persons not sitting as hereditary peers. It would be a somewhat invidious thing, he thought to make an exceptional rule in favour of the legal profession as was now suggested. It would be a great mistake, he might add, to suppose that in adopting the motion the House would be following the analogy of the case of the right rev. bench, the historical origin of whose claim to sit in that House was not *ex officio*, but as barons by tenure, because in ancient times they held great ecclesiastical fiefs from the Crown.—Earl Grey was also in favour of putting the previous question. Some such measure as that, he believed, was necessary. The "previous question" was then put and declared to be carried.

The *Alkali Act*.—Lord Ravensworth called attention to the defective provisions of the Alkali Act. It appeared that the acids of sulphur, the most injurious of all, were totally untouched by the present Act.—The Marquis of Ripon said the subject would receive careful consideration on the part of the Government.

Law Agents (Scotland) Bill.—The Lord Chancellor, on moving the second reading of this Bill, said that it provided for the abolition of various monopolies and special privileges of different corporations admitting law agents to practise; that there should be one general examination for the whole of Scotland; that any one passing such

examination should be entitled to practise in all the inferior courts; and that any one who passed a further examination should be admitted in the supreme courts. The Bill was read a second time.

The *Thames Embankment (Land) Bill*.—This Bill was read a third time and passed.

July 7.—*Agricultural Children Bill*.—This Bill having been read a third time, Lord Henniker proposed an amendment for the purpose of exempting reformatory schools. The amendment was agreed to and the Bill passed.

Prevention of Frauds on Charitable Funds Bill.—The Earl of Shaftesbury, in moving the second reading of this Bill, said its object was to put an end to those fraudulent cases in which, under the name of charitable associations, certain societies succeeded in obtaining money from the public, which they spent for their own purposes. He proposed that every charitable society should keep a register-book and a balance-sheet, and that every subscriber should have a right to inspect its books.—The Marquis of Salisbury drew attention to the effect of the Bill upon many of the small charities in country districts. Clause 4 declared that any person who, among other things, destroyed, altered, mutilated, or falsified any book or paper should be liable to be imprisoned and kept to hard labour for any period not exceeding six months. So that if a clerk within the office of a charitable association tore up a paper he might be sent to prison for six months.—The Lord Chancellor thought the Bill, however excellent in intention, was entirely impracticable. The effect of passing it would simply be that no man or woman of sense would have anything whatever to do with any charitable institution. The motion for the second reading of the Bill was withdrawn.

Ecclesiastical Commissioners Bill.—This Bill passed through committee.

July 8.—*Railway and Canal Traffic Bill*.—The Commons' amendments to certain amendments made by their Lordships in this Bill having been agreed to, the Marquis of Ripon asked the House to waive its amendment giving an appeal to courts of law from the decision of the commissioners in all cases, instead of merely on points of law, leaving the latter to be defined by the commissioners.—Lord Cairns urged that the security to be given for costs would prevent improper appeals, and he proposed the insertion of words which in arbitration cases would leave an appeal in the discretion of the commissioners. This modification of the amendment was agreed to. On a division it was decided by a majority of 79 to 63 to adhere to the amendment.

Appellate Jurisdiction of the House of Lords.—Lord Cairns, after referring to the circumstances under which the Judicature Bill passed the Lords, and the alteration which had been made in the Commons with reference to the Scotch and Irish appeals, said the course which had been taken was a most serious infringement of the privileges of that House. The rule was that any Bill affecting the limits of the jurisdiction of the House must be commenced in that House—and that, having commenced there, it could not be altered elsewhere. In 1851, when there was before the House of Commons a Bill for the improvement of the Court of Chancery which contained a clause empowering the House of Lords to require the assistance of the Equity as well as the Common Law Judges in hearing appeals, Lord Lyndhurst called attention to the measure, which he declared to be a breach of the privileges of the House. If the Bill came up from the other House with a provision which infringed the privileges of the House, there was only one course which could be adopted by the House, and that was to lay the Bill aside. Referring to the grounds on which they were called to agree to the cessation of appeals from England coming to that House, he said that the whole reason that existed for dealing with the English appeals in the way the Bill dealt with them failed entirely to apply to the case of Scotland and Ireland by leaving them the intermediate appeals they possessed. Moreover, since Scotch appeals would be heard by a Division with at least two Scotch members; Irish appeals by a Division with at least two Irish members; Indian appeals by a division in which at least the two Indian judges who at present sit in the Judicial Committee will be found; and English appeals by the English judges, there

would be not two co-ordinate Courts of Appeal, because the decisions of every one of those divisions would be irreversible, but a quadrilateral Court of Appeal—four Courts of Appeal deciding according to different grooves and running in different channels of thought. He denied that this infringement of their privileges was called for by the public opinion of Scotland and Ireland and drew attention to the evidence taken before the Lords' committee last year, of the contentment of the Scotch and Irish with their appeals coming to that House.—The Lord Chancellor pointed out that the Government did not originate the proposals complained of. They originated elsewhere, and the Government did not acquiesce in them until they were in possession of certain grounds, and what they thought sufficient grounds, for believing that Irish and Scotch opinions desired them, and that the representatives of those opinions were, indeed, prepared to force those proposals on the Government. No question of any breach of privilege ever occurred to any member of the Government, nor, as far as he knew, to anybody either in their Lordships' House or in the House of Commons. The doctrine that no Bill affecting the privileges or powers of that House should be introduced in the other House would be very inconvenient.—The Marquis of Salisbury asked what were the noble and learned Lord's views as to the proper method of ascertaining the wishes of the people of Scotland and Ireland on this question? A meeting of lawyers is held at Dublin, another in Edinburgh, and a third in a dining-room in London, and the opinion expressed at those meetings is held to be that of the people of Scotland and Ireland. If the Government were going to alter a sewer in Edinburgh under the Local Government Act, they would take more care to ascertain the feelings of people on the subject than they did when they were going to alter the Act of Union. If the House once passed over a breach of privilege the privilege was gone for ever, because it was a mere matter of usage and precedent, and once neglected it disappeared altogether. Should the House of Commons after that notice persist in sending up the Bill, with the clauses relating to the appellate jurisdiction of Scotland and Ireland in it, they would have no alternative left but either to renounce their privilege or to assert it.—The Duke of Richmond pointed out that, so far as the House was in possession of the views of the Scotch people on the subject, they were in favour of maintaining the jurisdiction of the House of Lords over their appeals. He hoped that warning would not be lost on the Government, for he was sincerely anxious that the Judicature Bill should become law.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

July 4.—*Supreme Court of Judicature Bill*.—The consideration of this Bill in committee was resumed on clause 18 (Power to transfer jurisdiction of Judicial Committee by Order in Council).—Mr. Hardy moved to omit from the clause the words which excepted ecclesiastical appeals from the jurisdiction of the new Court of Appeal. He had received several letters from clergymen which showed that they, as a body, were most desirous that ecclesiastical cases should go for decision before the new Court of Appeal. Mr. Vernon Harcourt, Dr. Ball, and Mr. Osborne Morgan supported the amendment, as did also Mr. Cross and Mr. Beresford Hope, and several other members.—Mr. Gladstone thought that men of honesty and integrity and legal competency, who had not received any peculiar training with reference to religious questions, would be well fitted to deal with ecclesiastical suits. The amendment, in his opinion, was an improvement of the Bill; he would not oppose the adoption of it. The amendment was then agreed to. After some conversation the clause, as amended, was agreed to.

Clauses 19 and 20 were agreed to without amendment. On Clause 21, Sir F. Goldsmid proposed an amendment, which was agreed to and the clause as amended was added to the Bill.

On clause 22, relating to "rules of law upon certain points," the Solicitor-General proposed to confine to England the law to be hereafter administered by the High Court of Justice and the Court of Appeal respectively. The proposal was agreed to.—Mr. Matthews moved the omission of section 2 of the clause, which provides that no claim of a *cestui que trust* against his trustee for any property held on an express trust shall be held to be barred by any Statute of Limitations. The sub-section imper-

fectly stated the doctrine of the Court of Equity, and it spoiled it in stating it.—The Solicitor-General said the sub-section made no alteration in the law. The words, which were not his, had been very carefully considered, and were designed merely to express the law as it stood. After some conversation, the amendment was negatived.

Mr. Gregory proposed in page 16, line 22, to leave out "Courts of Common Law" in order to insert "Court of Admiralty." After some conversation, the Attorney-General assented to the amendment, which was agreed to.

Mr. Hinde Palmer moved to insert words in sub-section 10 to provide that in all questions relating to the custody and education of infants the rules of Equity shall prevail. This was agreed to.

Mr. Hinde Palmer next moved that the remainder of the sub-section, which applies a similar rule to other cases not specified, of conflict between the rules of Equity and of Common Law, be created into a separate sub-section, and this was also agreed to. The clause as amended was then added to the Bill, as was also clause 24, which provides that the division of the legal year into terms shall be abolished so far as relates to the administration of justice.

On Clause 24 (Vacations), Mr. Harcourt moved the omission of the words which provide that the Vacations shall be fixed by her Majesty in Council on the report or recommendation of the Council of judges of the Supreme Court. He thought the judges might be worked in "shifts," like miners, so as to obviate the necessity of suspending the whole administration of the law for a considerable portion of the year. To pass the clause in this form would be tantamount to doing nothing at all; for, if the judges themselves were willing to make the change, the influence of the Bar would prevent them from doing so.—Mr. C. E. Lewis argued that the Long Vacation was an advantage to suitors. It was questionable whether more work would be got out of the judges and the Bar if they sat continuously than was done by them in nine months.—[Mr. Harcourt explained that he never intended to work them continuously, but only to arrange that the metropolis should never be left without two accessible Courts.] He contended that there were others besides lawyers who were interested in the cessation of litigious business for a time.—Mr. O. Morgan doubted very much whether the public interest would be served if the Judicial Bench were made intolerable. It was all very well for men whose life was a long-continued vacation to grudge judges their hardly-earned vacation. The effect of the amendment would be that two out of four Chancery Judges must be sitting the whole year.—Mr. Watkin Williams supported, and Mr. Locke opposed, the amendment. At this point the debate stood adjourned.

July 7th.—*The Crown Private Estates Bill*.—This Bill was read a first time.

Supreme Court of Judicature Bill.—The House resumed the discussion upon Mr. Vernon Harcourt's amendment on clause 24.—Mr. Rylands supported the amendment.—Mr. Serjeant Simon said that to leave the Ministers to fix the vacation of the judges would be to leave these arrangements to those who had not the requisite knowledge, and who, as Ministers of the Crown, ought not to have the smallest control over the independence of the Judicial Bench.—Colonel Barttelot held that during the vacation the Chancery judge should be bound to sit in London.—Mr. H. Palmer thought the Attorney-General might virtually accede to the amendment by allowing it to stand thus—"Her Majesty in Council may make rules."—The Attorney-General said he should propose two alterations in the clause—first, that any recommendation of the judges should have the consent of the Lord Chancellor; and he proposed to add words providing that the total amount of vacation should not be longer than at present.

In reply to Mr. T. Hughes, the Solicitor-General stated that, in consequence of the change which had been made relative to the Accountant-General's department, the administrative business of the Court of Chancery would be carried on during the Long Vacation.—Mr. Vernon Harcourt asked, as the judges had hitherto so interpreted the law as to allow of a judge being at an inaccessible distance, what security was there they would not continue to do so, and why should not security be taken in this Bill?—The Attorney-General ultimately agreed to the insertion of words to the effect that provision should be made for the

hearing of cases when necessary during the vacation in London and Middlesex.—Mr. Vernon Harcourt thereupon withdrew his amendment in favour of that proposed by the Attorney-General, which was agreed to, and the clause was added to the Bill.

On clause 26 (jurisdiction of the Judges of the High Court on circuit), Mr. Watkin Williams moved to leave out the words "or of law, or partly of fact and partly of law," believing that the interests of suitors were best consulted by the decision of questions of law in London.—The Attorney-General had no idea that, under this clause, questions of law would be decided by the courts in the country.—After a few words from Mr. Lopes and Mr. Whalley, the amendment was withdrawn. The clause, which was further amended, was then ordered to stand part of the Bill.

On clause 27, which provides for the continuous sittings of Courts in Middlesex and Westminster for the trial of causes, Mr. Cross moved an amendment providing for a somewhat similar arrangement in Lancashire. His object in proposing this amendment was that when the Judges arrived at Liverpool they should continue to sit there until all the assize business was over.—The Attorney-General said the amendment raised the question whether there should be central courts or provincial courts. The great majority of the Judicature Commission, after full consideration, were opposed to the setting up of provincial courts.—Mr. Serjeant Simon suggested that when the Government came to consider the question of the readjustment of the circuits, they should appoint a separate circuit for Lancashire.

On clause 28, which regulates the Divisions of the High Court of Justice, Mr. Raikes moved an amendment, the effect of which would be to restore to the Common Law Divisions the precedence over the Chancery Division of the High Court which sub-section 1 of this clause deprived them of. After some discussion the House divided, and the amendment was lost by 48 to 13.

The Solicitor-General then proposed, at page 18, line 21, to omit the rest of sub-section 1, in order to insert—" (1) One Division shall consist of the following Judges—that is to say, the Master of the Rolls, who shall be President thereof, and the Vice-Chancellors of the Court of Chancery, or such of them as shall not be appointed ordinary Judges of the Court of Appeal." This amendment was agreed to, as was also the omission of words in line 29 down to 34, and the substitution for them of a sub-section (2) providing that one other Division should consist of the Lord Chief Justice of England, who should be President thereof, and such of the other Judges of the Court of Queen's Bench as should not be appointed ordinary Judges of the Court of Appeal.

The remaining sub-sections were also agreed to. After some verbal amendments the clause, as amended, was ordered to stand part of the Bill.

On clause 28, Mr. Vernon Harcourt said the clause gave power to reduce the number of Divisions, but reserved the initiative absolutely for the council of the Judges. He thought Her Majesty in Council should recommend the reduction of the Divisions, and he moved an amendment to that effect. The amendment was negatived. Mr. Vernon Harcourt moved an amendment to the effect that the Order in Council might provide for the abolition on vacancy of the offices of any of the Judges who were constituted presidents of any of the Divisions which might be reduced, and of the salaries, pensions, and patronage attached to such offices, notwithstanding anything in the Bill relating to the continuance of such offices, salaries, pensions, and patronage. Agreed to.

The Attorney-General moved to add to the clause a proviso that the total number of the Judges of the Supreme Court should not be increased by any such order.—Mr. Osborne Morgan complained that on the matter of the increase of Equity Judges he had been "jockeyed" by the Attorney-General.—The Attorney-General repudiated with indignation the charge made against him by the hon. and learned gentleman, and challenged him to show that there was any foundation for that charge. After some further conversation, Mr. Matthews moved the insertion in the Attorney-General's amendment of the words "reduced or," so as to make it run thus:—"Provided always that the total number of the Judges

of the Supreme Court shall not be reduced or increased by such order" (in Council).—The Attorney-General's proviso, with the insertion of these words, was agreed to, and the clause as amended was then added to the Bill.

On clause 31 (division of business), the Attorney-General moved the omission, in line 24, of the words, "and the London Court of Bankruptcy." He said that the business of the Court of Chancery was considerably in arrear. The Court of Chancery was burdened with appeals in bankruptcy, and the object of the clause was to transfer that class of business to the Court where it could best be discharged. There were six Judges of the Court of Exchequer, and one could, pending final arrangements, be, without inconvenience, intrusted with the disposal of appeals in bankruptcy.—Mr. Amplett, Dr. Ball, Mr. O. Morgan, and Mr. Cross opposed the proposal.—The Solicitor-General said it had been originally suggested that one of the barons of the Court of Exchequer should be Chief Judge of the Court of Bankruptcy. The Judges of the Court of Exchequer would divide the bankruptcy business between them. He did not apprehend there would ever be fewer than sixteen judges, so that two could remain in town during the Assizes, and they would be fully able to attend to the bankruptcy business.

A motion to report progress was carried by 145 to 138.

Bills withdrawn.—The following bills were withdrawn:—Prevention of Crime Bill, Bank of England Notes Bill, Building Societies (No. 3) Bill, Fisheries (Ireland) Bill, Public Prosecutors Bill, and the Consolidated Rate Bill.

Conspiracy Law Amendment Bill.—This Bill was read a second time.

Minor's Protection Bill.—The order for the second reading of this Bill was discharged and the Bill withdrawn.

Canonries Bill.—The Lords' amendments to this Bill were considered and agreed to.

Seduction Laws Amendment Bill.—On the motion of Mr. Charley, the House went into Committee on this Bill. A clause repealing sections 50 and 51 of 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100, was agreed to, and the following clause was agreed to:—"Whosoever shall unlawfully and carnally know and abuse any girl under the age of 12 years shall be guilty of felony, and, being convicted thereof, shall be liable at the discretion of the Court to be kept in penal servitude for life, or for any term not less than five years, or to be imprisoned for any term not exceeding two years, with or without hard labour."

Mr. Wharton moved a clause providing that whipping may be added to other punishment if the girl is under 12 years old. On a division the clause was added to the Bill, which passed through committee.

Landlord and Tenant (Ireland) Act Amendment.—Mr. Butt brought in a Bill to make provision for more effectually securing the Ulster Tenant-right, and to amend the Landlord and Tenant (Ireland) Act, 1870.

Amalgamation of Railways.—Mr. Stapleton brought in a Bill to provide for the amalgamation of railways.

Treatment of Persons in Custody.—Mr. H. B. Sheridan brought in a Bill to regulate the treatment of persons in custody charged with crime and misdemeanour, whether on remand or committed for trial.

Medical Act.—Sir J. Lubbock brought in a Bill to amend the Medical Act as regards the University of London.

Elementary Education Act.—Mr. Heygate brought in a Bill to amend the Elementary Education Act, 1870.

July 8.—*Supreme Court of Judicature Bill.*—The consideration of this Bill in committee was resumed at clause 31 (Assignment of certain business to particular Divisions of the High Court subject to rules). The amendment of the Attorney-General in page 20, line 24, to leave out the words "and the London Court of Bankruptcy respectively," was, by leave, withdrawn, and the clause postponed.

Clauses 32 to 38 inclusive, with some verbal amendments, were agreed to.

Clause 39 (Distribution of Business among the Judges of the Chancery and Probate, Divorce, and Admiralty Divisions of the High Court). After a short conversation the clause was agreed to.

Clauses 40 and 41 were agreed to.

On Clause 42, Mr. Henley expressed a doubt whether "cases" sent up from Quarter Sessions would come under the term "appeals" provided for in this clause. The Attorney-General said both "cases" and "appeals" would come under the section. The clause was agreed to.

Clause 43 was also agreed to.

On clause 44, Mr. Harcourt proposed that her Majesty might, at her discretion; refer the petition of a person convicted of treason or felony to the Court of Appeal for consideration and advice, but withdrew it, saying he would propose it on the report. The clause was agreed to.

On clause 46, which sets forth what orders shall not be subject to appeal, the Attorney-General consented to limit the provision debaring appeals to orders affecting questions of costs only, omitting "matters of practice and procedure," which were included in the clause as drawn. This was agreed to, and the clause, as amended, was added to the Bill.

Clause 47 was agreed to.

On clause 48 (provision for absence or vacancy in the office of a judge), Mr. Amplett moved amendments the effect of which would be to enable the Lord Chancellor, when an appeal Judge was at liberty, to appoint that Judge, with his own consent, to sit in a Divisional Court. The amendments were agreed to, and the clause, as amended, was ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clause 49 was agreed to.

On clause 50, Mr. Gregory proposed after "either" to leave out "by the whole Court or," but ultimately withdrew his amendment in favour of one moved by Mr. Amplett, who proposed in page 27, line 32, to leave out "the whole Court" in order to insert "a full Court consisting of the whole, or any number not less than five." And should this amendment be carried, he proposed to move, in line 35, to leave out from "any appeal" to the end of the clause, in order to insert "the judgment of a full Court shall in all cases be final; the judgment of a Divisional court shall be final if it affirms the order appealed from, but in other cases any party aggrieved shall be entitled to have such appeal reheard by a full Court."—The Attorney-General said that if the committee were to accept the amendment the whole scheme of the Bill would be altered, and it would be almost impossible to go on with it. On a division the amendment was negatived by 177 to 144.

Mr. Matthews proposed to substitute "five" for "three" as the minimum number of judges in a Divisional Court.—The Attorney-General said that as the committee had determined, after full and fair discussion, that the number of ordinary judges should be ten, or at most eleven, it was utterly impossible to have fifteen judges. After some conversation the amendment was negatived by 161 to 129.

Mr. Pim moved an addition to the clause, providing that the Court of Appeal should sit in Edinburgh and Dublin.—The Attorney-General said this was a matter to be dealt with in the clauses relating to Scotland and Ireland, to be brought up on the report, if the understanding to that effect could be carried out. The amendment was withdrawn, and the clause was agreed to, as was also clause 51.

On clause 52, Sir R. Baggeley said there was no reason why one of the Divisions of the Court should be compelled to sit continuously for the purpose of dealing with one particular class of cases; and he also objected to the constitution of the Court. He proposed the first of two amendments to give effect to these objections. The amendment was negatived, and the clause was agreed to.

Progress was then reported.

International Arbitration.—Mr. Henry Richards moved an address to her Majesty praying that she will be pleased to instruct her Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs to enter into communication with foreign powers with a view to further improvement in International Law and the establishment of a general and permanent system of International Arbitration. After some debate, in which Mr. Gladstone pointed out that the adoption of the three Rules of the Washington Treaty was a step in the direction in which his hon. friend desired to go, but great risk would be run if, while a question of that kind was pending, we set about so ambitious a matter as inviting the powers of the world to adopt an arrangement for the construction of a code of international law and a general and permanent system of international arbitration. The motion was carried by 98 to 88.

Public Health Bill.—Sir C. Adderley, in moving that the House do go into committee on this Bill, stated that its main object was to consolidate the law relating to the public health, and make certain amendments in various parts of the existing law which the commissioners in their

report had declared to require alteration. After some debate the House went into committee, but progress was immediately reported.

July 10.—Judicature Bill.—Mr. Gladstone explained the course the Government intended to take with reference to Lord Cairns' recent speech. He referred to instances in which Bills had been introduced without objection in the Commons affecting the rights of the House of Peers. Among these were the Bills to relieve the members of the Episcopal Bench from their duties in the House of Lords brought forward in 1834, 1836, 1837, and 1838; a Bill introduced in the House of Commons in 1832 to abolish the right of voting by proxy in the House of Lords; the Bill of 1856 which dealt with the appellate jurisdiction of the Lords in relation to the creation of life peers for certain purposes, which was referred to a Select Committee; the Bill of 1868 for increasing the number of bishops, amended in the Commons by striking out provisions; the Irish Church Temporalities Act; and the Irish Church Act. On the other hand the Septennial Act and a Bill brought forward in 1832 altering the law relating to vacating seats on the acceptance of office, both of which dealt with the privileges of the House of Commons, were introduced in the other House. The course the Government proposed to take was to retain everything which relates to the complete and effectual constitution of the new Court of Appeal and to all matters collaterally incidental to that Court, but to forbear to ask the House to adopt those words which directly deal with the jurisdiction of the House of Lords, and the transfer of the appeals. If the House of Lords felt disposed on the merits to deal with these beneficial provisions and to accept them it would thus be able to pursue that course without finding itself entangled in any questions relating to the privileges of that House.—Mr. Bouverie said that, having looked into the matter it appeared to him that the contention of privilege on the part of the House of Lords in this matter was entirely unfounded. The jurisdiction of the House of Lords in Irish and Scotch appeals was conferred by Act of Parliament. The Acts of Union between England and Scotland, and between Great Britain and Ireland, which conferred that jurisdiction, were both of them introduced in the House of Commons and carried through the other House, without a single word being said with regard to the privileges of the peerage being interfered with.—Mr. Disraeli said that on reflection the intentions of the Government appeared to be that the House of Commons were to furnish certain salaries to certain officials, and the House of Lords were to assign to those officials the duties they were to perform in return for their salaries. After some further discussion the House went into committee on the Bill.

On clause 54 (referees), Mr. Gregory moved an amendment to leave out the words "and also without such consent."—The Solicitor-General said that the proposal of the hon. member would simply render the trial of certain cases impossible. Accounts, for example, could never be taken in court. The object of the clause was to save needless expense to suitors. At present matters of account were referred, but not until all the preliminary expenses of a trial had been incurred. He had seen a recent case against the Crown in which there were 400 items of account. Of course it was referred, but not until four counsel had been retained for the Crown, and three for the plaintiff; briefs had been given out, and all the preliminary expenses of the trial incurred.—Mr. Hunt objected to scientific referees. Scientific persons were generally men with theories, and the theories of the Court experts would be continually coming into collision with the theories of other experts.—Mr. Matthews thought that some limit should be put to the referring power of the judge. As to the proposal for the appointment of scientific referees, it was both novel and astounding. Were they to understand that the High Court of Appeal was to have its own paid chemist, engineer, and doctor?—Mr. Lopes, Mr. James, Mr. Amplett, Mr. O. Morgan, and Mr. S. Hill all expressed objection to the power given to the Judges at any time to shift from themselves the burden of trying causes. On a division Mr. Gregory's amendment was rejected by 76 to 55.

Mr. Matthews then proposed to insert after "at any time" the words "before notice of trial." His object was to prevent the scandal of persons being sent to a reference

after they had gone to all the expenses of preparing for a trial. The Attorney-General objected to the amendment as limiting too much the discretion of the Judge. The amendment was negatived, and the Committee divided on the clause, which was carried by 66 to 25.

Clauses 57, 58, and 59 were agreed to.

On clause 60 (District Registrars), Mr. Lopes said the District Registries would have jurisdiction unlimited both as to subject-matter and geographical extent. Under the new system any one might issue a writ in the District Registry against any one living anywhere. If the proceedings were not removed the cause would go to judgment in the district; and the decision of the District Registrar was practically without appeal. It was true that application might be made to the Judge, who might remove the whole proceedings. But there was no inherent right of appeal, and this power of applying to the Judge was a perfect illusion, for the Judge would be too apt to think the Registrar a competent person, nor could the grounds of objection to the Registrar's jurisdiction always be stated to the Judge. The Registrars would have to exercise judicial duties, to settle pleas and issues under a new system of pleading, to deal with particulars, to decide whether interrogatories should be administered, to decide also as to discovery and inspection of documents and the taking of partnership accounts. These were matters now dealt with by Judges and Masters, but hereafter they would be dealt with by Registrars, who would be practising attorneys within the district, unassisted by any Bar. As to expense, the only difference would be that hereafter under the Bill the local attorney would put the whole of the fees into his pocket, instead of dividing them with the London agent. As the District Registrars would decide differently all over the country upon points of law and practice, there would be the utmost confusion. He denied that the local solicitors favoured this local jurisdiction. He knew they did so with regard to the issue of writs and the dealing locally with mere ministerial matters; but they did not desire that contentious and judicial business should be disposed of locally.—Mr. Leeman said that the opinion of the country solicitors in Manchester, Liverpool, Birmingham, Leeds, and many other of our large towns, had been strongly expressed in favour of those clauses of the Bill. It was the crying evil of our law that the moment they got a Chancery suit, however small might be the amount it involved, into the office of the chief clerk of the Court in London, they could form no idea of the time when they would get it out of that office. If, however, as proposed by that Bill, District Registrars could, by directions from the High Court of Justice, go into and take accounts, there would be far less delay and expense incurred than if the business were entirely done in London. As to District Registrars not being able, especially in the absence of the Bar, to deal with contentious business, he would remark that it was only in difficult cases that country solicitors required to consult the Bar, and that they were obliged by their education to make themselves acquainted with the practice of both Law and Equity.—Sir R. Baggallay did not object to a certain amount of jurisdiction being conferred upon District Registrars; what was objected to was the proposal to commit to them "every proceeding, down to the entry of a case for trial"—powers so wide as to include the arrest of a ship, for example, a proceeding equivalent to the granting of an injunction.—The Solicitor-General said the first line of the clause provided that no powers were to be conferred on the District Registrars except under rules to be approved by the Lord Chancellor, the Lord Chief Justice, and a majority of the Judges—subject to the approval of Parliament. It never entered into the heads of the framers of the Bill to give to the Registrars any such power as his hon. and learned friend feared they would assume under the Bill. Of course, Rules of Court would be issued preventing plaintiffs from oppressing defendants by suing them at unreasonable distances save where the cause of action arose in the plaintiff's district; and the effect of the provision would be to save great expense and be a mercy even to defendants. After some further discussion the clause, as amended, was added to the Bill.

Clauses 63 to 72, inclusive, were agreed to.

On clause 73, Mr. R. N. Fowler moved an amendment to

entitle District Registry Clerks of the Court of Probate to the same progressive salaries and the scale of superannuation as were enjoyed by the clerks of the principal Registry Office, and to secure retiring allowances to those persons.—The Chancellor of the Exchequer opposed the amendment. On a division it was rejected by 171 to 49.

Clause 74 was agreed to.

On clause 75, Mr. Lopes moved that the word "Secretary" be omitted from the Bill, in order to insert the words "Principal Clerk." The amendment was negatived.

OBITUARY.

MR. F. WALFORD.

The recorderships of Saffron Walden, and of Maldon, in Suffolk, have become vacant by the decease of Mr. Frederic Walford, barrister-at-law, who died at Burwash, in Sussex, on the 4th July, in his 60th year. The deceased was the only son of the late Joseph Green Walford, Esq., Solicitor to the Customs, and Recorder of Maldon, and was born in 1812. Mr. F. Walford was educated at the Charterhouse and at Trinity College, Cambridge, where he graduated in 1833. He was called to the bar at the Inner Temple in November, 1845; and went the Home Circuit, attending also the Colchester and Essex Sessions. In December, 1851, he was appointed Recorder of Maldon, in succession to his father, and became Recorder of Saffron Walden in February, 1855.

SOCIETIES AND INSTITUTIONS.

INCORPORATED LAW SOCIETY.

A special general meeting of the society was held in the hall of the society on Monday last, Park Nelson, Esq., President, in the chair.

The President stated the object of the meeting as contained in the following circular convening the meeting, which was taken as read.

"Incorporated Law Society, Chancery-lane,
June 25th, 1873.

Sir,—In settling the minutes of the late adjourned special general meeting of the society, held on the 11th instant, and concerting arrangements for the forthcoming annual general meeting, the Council have had their attention drawn to the fact that several of the bye-laws proposed by the President were carried with amendments, which, though in most instances accepted by him, had been formally proposed by private members of the society, so that the bye-laws in this amended form might be considered to fall within the operation of the 17th old bye-law, and therefore require confirmation at a subsequent meeting. But inasmuch as by the same bye-law the time for holding the second meeting must be appointed at the meeting at which the bye-laws in question were carried, it has become impossible to hold any second meeting, and obtain the confirmation which seems to be required. As the only escape from this difficulty which presents itself, and with a view to giving unquestioned validity to those bye-laws which were so amended at the instance of private members of the society, it has been determined to hold another special general meeting, at which the bye-laws in question should be formally proposed by the Council for adoption by the society; after which no confirmation will become necessary.

I am therefore directed to inform you that a special general meeting of the members of the society will be held at the hall of the society in Chancery-lane, on Monday, the 7th July next, at two o'clock in the afternoon precisely, when the adoption of bye-laws Nos. 10, 24, 25, 53, 59, 60, and 61, which were approved and passed at the late meeting, will be moved by the President on behalf of the Council.—I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

E. W. WILLIAMSON, Secretary."

The President then read the bye-laws Nos. 10, 24, 25, 53, 59, 60, and 61 (which, in the reprint of the bye-laws since the special general meeting, held on the 11th June last, had, in consequence of amendments then made, been renumbered 10, 24, 25, 49, 55, 56, and 57), and, on behalf of the Council, moved the adoption of such bye-laws.

The motion was seconded by the Vice-President, and carried *nemine dissente*.

It was moved by Mr. Macarthur, duly seconded and resolved, that the thanks of the meeting be given to the Chairman for the manner in which he had conducted the meeting.

LAW STUDENTS' JOURNAL.

FINAL EXAMINATION.

Trinity Term, 1873.

Alford, William	Ford, Frederick Wilbraham
Allen, Arthur Barrow	Randle
Andrews, George Lancelot	George, Edward
Badger, Wilfred	Gillett, Frederick George
Baldrey, Samuel Henry	Stanford
Bantoft, William, jun.	Gillett, William Edward
Barlow, James Edward	Glaisher, Henry
Barnard, Edward Ernest	Grahame, Archibald Gra-
Batchelor, Harry	hame Moncrieff
Bate, Samuel Stringer	Groy, Hubert Allen
Baylis, Charles, jun.	Griffith, Henry
Beck, Ralph Coker Adams	Grundy, Joseph
Beard, Walter James West-	Gullaume, Thomas
cott	Guillemaud, Arthur George
Bertie, James	Hall, James Ralph
Black, Frederick Theodore	Hamer, Henry
Cornelius	Hand, Henry
Black, John	Handley, James
Bloxam, Francis Richard	Harrison, William, jun.
Turner	Hartley, William Harry
Borlase, Christopher Gullett	Harvey, Henry Fairfax
Bowden, John Higginbotham	Haward, Walter Robinson
Breed, Edward Aries Thomas	Hawkins, Montagu
Brettell, James Vaughan	Head, Evelyn Aston
Brewis, John	Hedges, Killingworth Richd.
Brimacombe, Ralph Cole	Henderson, Charles Fredk.
Broad, Thomas John	Hill, Charles Watson
Broadbent, Spencer	Hinton, Edmund
Brockman, Alfred Drake	Hitchins, Henry
Broome, Frank	Hockin, William Lamb
Broughton, John Nightin-	Holgate, Edwin James
gale	Hooper, Frederick Mont-
Browne, Edward Utten	gomery Barry
Burn, Thomas Cuthbert	Hopkins, John Leifohild
Burney, William	Horsfield, Henry
Burr, Thomas Henry	Houghton, Gilbert
Burrell, William	James, Edward Nugent
Burrows, Robert, Creswell	Jeffery, Francis Ronald
Chadwick, Thomas Lang	Johnstone, James Marsh
Chandler, Francis Samuel	Jones, Henry Warren
Chapman, Samuel	Jones, John
Cheale, Sidney Alexander	Jones, William
Clark, Jonathan, jun.	Kelly, Frederick Jessop
Clarke, Walter Percy	Kershaw, John
Coates, Edward Henry	Kilby, John Henry
Coates, William Henry	Kirby, Alfred
Codd, Walter. B.A.	Layton, Thomas
Collins, Ferdinando Strat-	Leeds, Charles Edward
ford	Lindsell, Fredk. Raymond
Cook, William James	Barber
Cope, Harry Alexander	Lucas, Earnest Frederick
Cope, John Garland	Bourne
Cotching, Joseph Flint Alex-	Maples, Harold Stanley
ander	May, Henry
Cox, William	Meeres, Fredk. Augustus
Cozens-Hardy, Sidney	Michelmores, Jeffery Ed-
Dean, Josiah	wardens
Dew, Griffith Davies	Mills, Frederick William
Dickson, George Herbert	Mills, Walter Henry
Dowdall, Charles	Molesworth, Fredk. Nassau
Du Moulin, Charles Nicholas	Morecroft, Herbert Johnston
Edgworth, Thomas John	Moses, Henry William
Edmonds, Thomas, jun.	Moulding, Walter Glover
Edwards, John James, jun.	Mumford, Sidney Sugar
Edwards, William Henry	Myer, Herman Henry
Etches, James Meymoth	Nash, Henry Dalton
Firth, Henry Mallaby	Nash, William
Fletcher, William George	Nothgraves, Charles
Dimock	Nuttall, Charles Ross
Flint, Charles Albert	Palmer, Henry

Parnell, Henry Edward	Stead, Robert John
Parton, George Adolphus	Stephens, Thomas English
Patrick, John, jun.	Stow, Montague Haslam
Paxton, John	Stuart, Frederick
Peake, Tom Walter	Sweet, Charles
Peddar, Sydney Hampden	Swift, Edward
Pettitt, Maurice	Summer, John Bird
Philpin, Bernard	Tanner, Arthur
Piper, Frank Harvey	Tanner, William
Poole, William	Tanqueray, Fredk. Thomas
Pope, John Noble Coleman	Tattershall, Evelyn Brooks-
Prance, Henry Penrose	bank
Preston, Donald William	Taylor, Henry Alfred
Prichard, Charles Edward	Tedder, James George
Crosse	Thomas, George
Prichard, Iltyd Moline	Thomas, Matthew Watson,
Pritchard, Henry	jun.
Pugh, John Hunter	Thompson, Henry
Quilter, Charles	Thrower, Ernest
Rawlinson, Francis	Times, William Onslow
Reiner, Herbert Arthur	Toller, Ernest Edward
Robbins, Charles	Tyrer, Alfred
Robins, Henry Edward	Walker, Edward
Robinson, John	Walker, George Walton
Rogers, Alfred Thomas	Walthew, Edmond George
Roper, Sydney Chas. Dyne	Warner, William Henry
Rothera, Frederic William	Waugh, Edward Lamb
Rouse, Edward Broughton,	White, Henry
B.A.	Williams, Arthur Ormond
Rundle, Richard Albert	Williamson, James, jun.
Saxby, Joseph	Windeatt, Edward
Slaney, Thomas	Winnett, Howard Samuel
Smallshaw, John	Wise, William
Smith, George Varty	Woodburne, Thomas
Smith, Wm. Haworth Glynn	Worsley, James Edwardson
Sparke, James John	Wray, Aaron
Stausfeld, Raywood Mickle-	Wyles, Harry
waite	Young, Adrian
Stafford, Zacheus	Young, John Arnold

PUBLIC COMPANIES.

GOVERNMENT FUNDS.

LAST QUOTATION, July 11, 1873.

3 per Cent. Consols, 92½	Annuities, April, '85 9½
Ditto for Account, Aug. 1, 92½	Do. (Red Sea T.) Aug. 1898
3 per Cent. Reduced 92½	Ex Billa, £1000, — per Ct. 3 dis.
New 3 per Cent., 92½	Ditto, £500, Do. — 3 dis.
Do. 3½ per Cent., Jan. '94	Ditto, £100 & £300, — 3 dis.
Do. 3½ per Cent., Jan. '94	Bank of England Stock, 4½ per
Do. 5 per Cent., Jan. '73	Ct. (last half-year) 24½
Annuities, Jan. '80 —	Ditto for Account.

INDIAN GOVERNMENT SECURITIES.

India Stk., 10½ p Ct. Apr. '74, 205	Ind. Inf. Pr., 5 p Ct., Jan. '73
Ditto for Account. —	Ditto, 3½ per Cent., May, '79 14½
Ditto 5 per Cent., July, '80 108	Ditto Debentures, per Cent.,
Ditto for Account. —	April, '64 —
Ditto 4 per Cent., Oct. '85 104	Do. Do. 5 per Cent., Aug. '78 101
Ditto, ditto, Certificates, —	Do. Bonds, 4 per Ct., £1000
Ditto Enforced Pr., 1 per Cent. 96½	Ditto, ditto, under £1000

RAILWAY STOCK.

	Railways.	Paid.	Closing Prices.
Stock	Bristol and Exeter	100	115
Stock	Caledonian	100	92½
Stock	Glasgow and South-Western	100	125
Stock	Great Eastern Ordinary Stock	100	40½
Stock	Great Northern	100	127
Stock	Do. A Stock	100	131
Stock	Great Southern and Western of Ireland	100	114
Stock	Great Western—Original	100	123
Stock	Lancashire and Yorkshire	100	145
Stock	London, Brighton, and South Coast	100	75
Stock	London, Chatham, and Dover	100	22
Stock	London and North-Western	100	146½
Stock	London and South-Western	100	107½
Stock	Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincoln	100	74½
Stock	Metropolitan	100	70
Stock	Do. District	100	30½
Stock	Midland	100	137
Stock	North British	100	64½
Stock	North Eastern	100	162½
Stock	North London	100	117
Stock	North Staffordshire	100	70
Stock	South Devon	100	72
Stock	South-Eastern	100	107

* A receives no dividend until 6 per cent. has been paid to B.

MONEY MARKET AND CITY INTELLIGENCE.

The Bank rate has been reduced from 6 per cent. to 5 per cent. The proportion of reserve to liabilities has risen from 36½ per cent. to 42½ per cent. The railway market has been dull, and prices have somewhat declined. The South Eastern dividend has been announced at 3½ per cent. There has been but little business done in the foreign market. Spanish on Monday and Thursday was under 20.

The Atlantic and Great Western Railway Company has authorised the issue of £1,520,000 sterling eight per cent. Western Extension certificates, in certificates to bearer of £100 each, specially secured by the deposit with trustees in London of 76,000 shares, £20 each of the Cleveland, Columbus, Cincinnati and Indianapolis Railway Company, and of 152,000 shares of £10 each, of the Atlantic and Great Western Railroad Company. The price of issue is £94 per cent., redeemable at par in London on the 1st July, 1876; or, at the option of the holder on six months' notice in writing prior to that date, convertible into £100 Cleveland, Columbus, Cincinnati and Indianapolis Railway Company's shares, and £100 Atlantic and Great Western Railroad Company's shares, for each certificate of £100; and bearing interest at the rate of eight per cent. per annum, by coupons payable half-yearly on 1st January and 1st July in London. The first coupon will fall due 1st January, 1874. The trustees are Sir John Swinburne, Bart., Capheaton, Newcastle-on-Tyne; Henry Wollaston Blake, Esq., M.A., F.R.S., 8, Devonshire-place, London, and the prospectus states that the issue of these certificates is to provide the means for securing the controlling interest in the Cleveland, Columbus, Cincinnati and Indianapolis Railway, by acquiring 76,000 shares, being a clear majority of the capital stock of that company, for which provisional agreements have been made.

Mann's Railway Sleeping Carriage Company (Limited), the prospectus of which was issued this week, states that the company is formed for the purpose of constructing, maintaining, and running sleeping carriages on any and all railway lines in Europe, with which contracts are or shall be made. The company will own and manage the sleeping carriages, placing a conductor in charge of each, and keep the inside in order. The railway companies will haul the carriages, receiving the ordinary fares for each passenger; while the Sleeping Carriage Company receives a supplement or additional price from each passenger, for the use of the beds, linen, lavatories, &c. The capital of the company is £200,000 in 19,700 preferred shares of £10 each, and 3,000 deferred shares of £1 each, 7,000 of the former being now offered at par. The subscription list will close on Monday next for London, and on Tuesday for the country.

The Globe Telegraph and Trust Company (Limited) is a new undertaking, the capital being £3,000,000 divided into 150,000 six per cent. preference shares of £10 each (interest payable quarterly), and 150,000 ordinary shares of £10 each (interim dividends, contingent on profits, payable quarterly). The prospectus states that the company has been formed for the consolidation of telegraphic property, so as practically to guarantee a dividend to the investor by spreading the risk as much as possible over existing telegraph systems running in various directions. Subscriptions will be received in cash or shares of existing telegraph companies, a list of which is given in the prospectus.

The prospectus of the Rio Tinto Company states that the company has been formed with the principal object of purchasing and developing the well-known mining property of Rio Tinto, in the South of Spain, containing the richest and most important of all the great mineral deposits which extend from Seville to beyond the mines of Santo Domingo in Portugal. The property is freehold in perpetuity, and contains 4,710 English acres in one connected tract, embracing nearly the whole of the town of Rio Tinto. The celebrated Tharsis Mine is situated on the same mineral range. The distinctive feature of this undertaking, and in which it differs from almost all other mining adventures, is the undoubted fact that the enormous deposits of ore known and actually proved to exist in the mines fully secures their future against the usual risks attendant upon mining operations in general. It is merely a question of the demand and the cost of working. The directors believe the first to be fully sufficient to ensure a sale at goods prices, and that the second can, by judicious

management, be kept down to a point which will ensure a large return upon the capital employed. The capital of the company is £2,250,000, the present issue being for £2,000,000 in shares of £10 each. £3 10s. per share is only required at present.

COURT PAPERS.

GENERAL RULE MADE IN PURSUANCE OF THE BANKRUPTCY ACT, 1869 (32 & 33 VICT. c. 71).

It is ordered as follows, that is to say:—

APPEALS.

1. Rule 150 of the Bankruptcy Rules, 1870, be and the same is hereby rescinded.

2. The office for entering Bankruptcy Appeals shall be kept open daily throughout the year, from ten till four o'clock, except on Sunday, Christmas Day, Good Friday, the Saturday after Good Friday, Monday and Tuesday in Easter week, or any day appointed for a public fast or thanksgiving, and except also on Saturdays, when the office may be closed at two o'clock; and the days on which the office shall be wholly closed shall not be reckoned in the number of days ordered for the entering of appeals.

SELBORNE, C.

JAMES BACON, Chief Judge.

I, the Right Honorable Roundell, Baron Selborne, Lord High Chancellor of Great Britain, do, under the powers vested in me by the County Court Rules, hereby order that the offices of the county courts may be closed on the 4th day of August, 1873.

Given under my hand this 9th day of July, 1873.

SELBORNE, C.

ESTATE EXCHANGE REPORT.

AT THE MART.

By Messrs. NORTON, TRIST & WATNEY.

Surrey, Betchworth—Harman's Farm, containing 15a. 1r. 16p.,—sold for £1,150.

Enclosures of land, containing 12a. 3r. 38p.—sold for £750.

Spitalfields—Nos. 32, 34, and 35, Crispin-street, freehold—sold for £3,300.

Nos. 30, 31, and 33, adjoining—sold for £1,800.

Nos. 47, 47A, 47B, and 47C. same street—sold for £2,000.

Nos. 48 and 49, Crispin-street—sold for £1,510.

By Messrs. NEWSON, STANLEY & CO.

Bermundsey—Nos. 13 to 16, Little Cherry Garden-street, freehold—sold for £570.

City—No. 7, Printing house-square, term 109 years; also the Queen Victoria Hotel, freehold—sold for £10,000.

By Messrs. FAREBROTHER, CLARKE & CO.

Canterbury—Barton Fields, freehold residence, with pleasure grounds—sold for £2,600.

Lambeth—Nos. 56 and 62, Kennington-road—sold for £850.

By Mr. E. ROBINS.

Teddington—Freehold residence, known as The Grove, and 13a. 2r.—sold for £7,709.

By Messrs. DERENHAM, TEWSON & FARMER.

City—No. 153, Houndsditch, term 72 years—sold for £1,360.

By Messrs. DRIVER.

Eaton-square—No. 112, with stabling, term 51 years—sold for £10,500.

Hants, Bishopstoke—Stoke Lodge, and 64a. 3r. 9p., freehold—sold for £4,600.

Enclosures containing 11a. 2r. 8p.—sold for £1,000.

Hannington—Enclosures of arable and woodland, 111a. 3r. 14p.—sold for £2,340.

Droxford, Homer Hill—Wood and Poord Wood, containing 129a. 3r. 16p.—sold for £2,760.

Long Sutton—Enclosures containing 35a. 3r. 37p.—sold for £1,400.

Stroud Wood Common—Woodlands, containing 15a. 3r. 0p.—sold for £505.

Crondall—A cottage and heath land, containing 112a. 3r. 23p.—sold for £2,000.

Yateley—Allotments of land, containing 83a. 1r. 3p.—sold for £1,650.

East Meon—An allotment of land, containing 24a. 1r. 11p.—sold for £260.

Stroud Common—An allotment of land, containing 5a. 1r. 6p.—sold for £400.

By Messrs. GLASIER & SONS.

Kent, near Penhurst—Freehold farms, containing 173a. 0r. 17p., freehold—sold for £7,900.

BIRTHS, MARRIAGES, AND DEATHS.

BIRTHS.

CARDALE—On July 4, at 5, Gordon-place, W.C., the wife of George Cardale, of Lincoln's-inn, barrister-at-law, of a daughter.

WHEELER—On July 4, at Northfield, St. Mary Cray, Kent, the wife of T. W. Wheeler, Esq., barrister-at-law, of a daughter.

MARRIAGES.

CAPEL—REDPATH—On July 3, at St. Luke's, New Kentish-town, Henry Nelson Capel, Esq., LL.B., of Lincoln's-inn-fields and North Brixton, to Mary Neill Underwood, eldest daughter of the Rev. Robert Redpath, M.A., of College-place, Camden-town.

HOPKINSON—WELLS—On July 3, at the parish church, Old Bedford, Notts, Alfred Hopkinson, of Lincoln's-inn, barrister-at-law, to Esther, youngest daughter of the late Henry Wells, Esq., Nottingham.

KELLY—HYDE—On July 3, at the parish church of Westbury-on-Trym, near Bristol, James Kelly, Esq., of Yeovil, Somerset, solicitor, to Amy, fourth daughter of the late Rev. William Hyde, rector of Donyatt, Somerset.

POPHAM—BAGEHOT—On July 3, at St. Andrew's church, Curry Rivel, Somerset, John Francis Popham, Esq., of the Middle Temple, barrister-at-law, to Florence Eveline, younger daughter of Watson Bagehot, Esq., of Heale, Curry Rivel.

WILLIAMS—ORMEROD—On July 2, at St. Cuthbert's church, Lytham, Theodore Ellis Williams, B.A., of the Inner Temple, Esq., barrister-at-law, to Ellen Ann, eldest daughter of G. H. Ormerod, Esq., J.P., of Lytham, and Newchurch in Rossendale.

DEATHS.

BURNARD—On July 5, at Leigh Villa, Leigh-road, Highbury, John T. N. Burnard, Esq., solicitor, of Norfolk-street, Strand, and Saint James's-street, S.W.

MILLER—On July 1, Samuel Frederick Miller, Esq., of 4, King-street, St. James's-square, and 7, Warwick-square, Fimlico, in the 71st year of his age.

LONDON GAZETTES.

Professional Partnerships Dissolved.

FRIDAY, July 4, 1873.

Banner, Edward, Edward Wingham Bird, James Banner Newton, William Henry Lacy, and Joseph Richardson, Solicitors and Attorneys-at-Law, Liverpool. July 2

Marsden, Joseph Daniel, and Edward Larpent Agar, Solicitors, Friday-street, London. June 23

Wells, William, Richard Ridehalgh, and Walter Gardiner, Attorneys and Solicitors. July 2

Winding up of Joint Stock Companies.

FRIDAY, July 4, 1873.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Camp Floyd Silver Mining Company, Limited.—By an order made by V.C. Wickens, dated June 23, it was ordered that the above company be wound up. Snell, George st, Mansion House, solicitor for the petitioner.

Glain Pedror Mining Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented June 28, directed to be heard before V.C. Bacon on July 12. Flower and Nussey, Great Winchester at Buildings, solicitors for the petitioner.

STANNARIES OF CORNWALL.

Pendarves United Mines Company.—Petition for winding up, presented June 28, directed to be heard before the Vice-Wardens, at the Princes Hall, Truro, on Tuesday, July 24, at 12. Affidavits intended to be used at the hearing, in opposition to the petition, must be filed at the Registrar's Office, Truro, on or before Friday, July 18. Hodge and Co, Truro; agents for Downing, Redruth, petitioner's solicitor.

TUESDAY, July 8, 1873.

UNLIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Royal Victoria Palace Theatre Syndicate.—Petition for winding up, presented July 3, directed to be heard before V.C. Bacon, on July 19. Bolton, Elm court, Temple, solicitor for the petitioners.

St. George Advance Fund Association.—By an order made by V.C. Bacon, dated July 1, it was ordered that the above associations, Nos. 6, 13, and 18, be wound up by the Court. Roberts, Coleman st, solicitor for the petitioner.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

TUESDAY, July 8, 1873.

Sao Vicente Mining Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented July 4, directed to be heard before V.C. Malins, on Friday, July 18. Price and Co, New square, Lincoln's inn; agents for Downing, Redruth, solicitor for the petitioners.

Creditors under Estates in Chancery.

Last Day of Proof.

TUESDAY, July 1, 1873.

Arrowsmith, John, Hereford square, Brompton, Gent. July 31. Arrowsmith & Arrowsmith, V.C. Bacon. Lincoln, Gray's inn square

Coke, Henry Simmons, Horse, Sussex, Gent. July 23. Coke & Tuttle, M.B. Longstaff, Berners st

Gadsden, John, Oxford st, Cheesemonger. July 30. Gadsden & Gadsden V.C. Wickens, Flower, Bedford row

Hallam, Alfred, Worcester, Coach Builder. July 28. Hallam & Hallam, V.C. Wickens. Abel, Worcester

Jackson, William, Pontefract, Yorkshire, Gent. July 28. Jackson & Pease, V.C. Wickens. Arundel, Pontefract

Morley, Richard, Liverpool, Fruit Merchant. July 26. Morley & Dyke Registrar for the Liverpool District

Perret, Edmund, Merston Morrell, Warwickshire, Farmer. Sept 1. Lane & Perret, V.C. Malins. Castle, Southampton st, Bloomsbury

Rickwood, Susannah Jones, Clifton, near Bristol, Widow. Aug 5. Rhodes & Rhodes, V.C. Wickens. Winter and Co, Bedford row

FRIDAY, July 4, 1873.

Cockbill, Phillip, Swindon, Wilts, Jankeeper. July 28. Cockbill & Cockbill, V.C. Malins. Kinneir, Swindon

Colchester, Charles Bye, Threadneedle st, Broker. July 28. Colchester & Colchester, V.C. Malins. Watson, Fakenham

Dash, James, Brighton, Sussex, Dentist. July 28. Dash & Dash, V.C. Malins. Stibbard, Fenchurch st

Gibson, Thomas, Grove st, Park terrace, South Hackney, Licensed Victualier. July 28. Gibson & Huxley, M. R. Voss, Vestry hall, Church row, Bethnal Green

Lane, John, Cirencester, Gloucestershire, Corn Merchant. July 31. Lock & Lane, V.C. Wickens. Hubbard, Walbrook

Ringer, Benjamin, Tharston, Norfolk. July 28. Muskett & Ringer, V.C. Bacon. Yetts, Lincoln's inn fields

Royce, Jerimiah, Market Deeping, Lincolnshire, Spinster. July 26. Aldwinckle & Brown, M. R. Phillips, Stamford

Shout, James Tagus, Park side, Knightsbridge, Pawnbroker. Sept 1. Shout & Shout, V.C. Malins. Hughes, Bedford st, Covent garden

TUESDAY, July 8, 1873.

Davis, Mary, Mary's terrace, Ford rd, Old Ford, Widow. July 23. Furniss & Davis, V.C. Wickens. Braikenridge, Bartlett's buildings

Kraushaar, Pincus, Birmingham. July 30. Mann & Kraushaar, V.C. Wickens. Wright and Marshall, Birmingham

Whiteley, William, Hightown, Bristol, York, Gent. July 30. Cowburn & Whiteley, V.C. Malins. Chadwick, Dewsbury

Creditors under 22 & 23 Vict. cap. 35.

Last Day of Claim.

FRIDAY, July 4, 1873.

Austin, Charlotte Apauline, Carlton, near Moulbourne, Victoria. Aug 1. Lawrence and Co, Old Jewry chambers

Borlase, George, Penance, Cornwall, Commander H.M.N. July 31. Childs and Batten, Fleet st

Bracewell, Christopher, Charlton-upon-Medlock, Lancashire, Butcher. Aug 15. Bunting and Bingham, Manchester

Bradley, James Bradley, Brighton, Sussex, Doctor. Oct 1. Battye, Huddersfield

Bradbury, James, Huddersfield, Yorkshire, Esq. Nov 1. Battye, Huddersfield

Campbell, Mary, La Roche, Brigatton, Sussex, Widow. Aug 30. Fatvove and Feige, John st, Bedford row

Cherry, George Henville, Port Said, Egypt, Captain. Aug 4. Gosling, Spring gardens

Crooke, Samuel Thomas, Halifax, Yorkshire, Ironmonger. Aug 10. Wavell and Co, Halifax

Crosby, James, Kancora, Cheshire, Licensed Victualier. July 30. Day, Runcorn

Despard, Elizabeth Huntly, Bristol, Widow. Aug 12. Livett, Bristol

Dixon, Mary Ann, Cheshire, widow. Aug 30. Barker and Hignett, Cheshire

Drew, George, sen, Theale, Somersetshire, Yeoman. Aug 1. Hobbs, jun, Wells

Duxbury, William Kirk, Lee's, Stay Maker. Sept 5. Middleton and Sons, Leeds

Edwards, Cordelia, New Ferry, Cheshire, Spinster. Aug 4. Laces and Co, Liverpool

Ewens, William Daniel, Crawkerne, Somersetshire, Merchant. Sept 29. Budge

Garside, Robert, Leeds, Colliery Proprietor. Sept 10. Emsley, Leeds

Graham, John, Whitrigg, Cumberland, Yeoman. Sept 1. Hough, Carlisle

Grigg, William, Charlton-upon-Medlock, Manchester, Gent. July 31. Bunting and Bingham, Manchester

Halford, Henry, Warwick, Farm Bailiff. Aug 1. Snape, Warwick

Kelso, Frances Lætitia Philippa, Hyde park square, Widow. Sept 2. Nisbet and Co, Lincoln's inn fields

Longstaff, Joseph, Camberwell Newrd, Gent. July 30. Vant, Leaden-hall st

Moore, James, Aspatria, Cumberland, Farmer. Aug 1. Wicks, Cockermouth

Motham, John, Bristol Accountant. Aug 12. Livett, Bristol

Perry, Richard, Suffolk st, Pall Mall, Esq. Sept 2. Nisbet and Co, Lincoln's inn fields

Pennefather, Rev. William, Mildmay Park. Sept 2. Nisbet and Co, Lincoln's inn fields

Richardson, Elizabeth, Rothdale, Lancashire, Widow. Aug 20. Jenkins and Co, Liverpool

Summer, Richard, Puttenham Priory, Surrey, Esq. Oct 1. Curtis, Guildford

Thompson, William, Baccleugh terrace, Upper Clapton, Esq. Aug 19. Baxter and Co, Victoria st, Westminster

Watson, James, Liverpool, Glass Merchant. July 19. Radcliffe, Blackburn

Wheelhouse, Henry, Clifford, Bramham, Yorkshire, Farmer. Aug 6. Middleton and Sons, Leeds

Wilkins, John, Stoke Trister, Somersetshire, Yeoman. Aug 1. Hobbs, jun, Wells

Willemott, Richard, Norwich, Gent. Aug 1. Brightwell, Norwich

Williams, Mary, Aborgole, Denbigh, Druggist. Sept 1. Goll and Co, Denbigh

TUESDAY, July 8, 1873.

Aford, Elizabeth, Plymouth, Devonshire, Widow. Sept 4. Elworthy and Co, Plymouth

Atkinson, Bryan Waller, Burton, Westmorland, Esq. July 21. Mortimer, Newcastle-upon-Tyne

Austin, Robert, Barlow Moor, Lancashire, Yeoman. July 31. Hewitt, Manchester

Barrow, Edward Tomlinson, Clifton, Bristol, Wins Merchant. Aug 9. Faulk, Ilminster

Baazette, Emmeline, Chapel st, Grosvenor square, Spinster. Aug 9.
 Gregory and Co, Bedford row
 Boxall, James, Brighton, Sussex, Coachmaker. Sept 1. Chalk, Brighton
 Calcott, Henry, Horsmonden, Kent. Gent. Aug 33. Hinds, Gouldhurst
 Cleaver, William, Marden, Kent, Veterinary Surgeon. Sept 10. Hinds, Gouldhurst
 Cornes, William, Smarden, Kent, Farmer. Sept 1. Hinds, Gouldhurst
 Cotton, Frederick, Soho Hill, Handworth, Staffordshire, Gent. Aug 19.
 Wright and Marshall, Birmingham
 Dunne, Letitia Anne, Hurst, Berks, Widow. Aug 8. Roy and Cartwright, Litchbury
 Filmer, Thomas Henry, Berners st, Oxford st, Upholsterer. Aug 12.
 Bailey & Co, Berners st
 Finch, Thomas, Gordon terrace, Holland st, Kensington. July 31.
 Roberts, Goddman st, Doctors commons
 Harter, Rev George Gardner, Cranfield Court, Bedfordshire. Aug 19.
 Sister and Co, Manchester
 Hewitt, William, Higher Broughton, near Manchester, Beerhouse
 - Keeper. Aug 9. Hankinson, Manchester
 Horridge, Thomas Gardner, Great Lever, Lancashire, Esq. Aug 31.
 Bailey and Read, Bolton-le-Moors
 Kirsop, Jane Margaret, Wolsingham, Durham, Widow. Aug 31.
 Garrett, Donzly st
 Livins, Lucy, Clifton, Bristol, Widow. Aug 31. Iliffe and Co, Bedford
 row
 Middleton, Robert Oldham, D. dsbury, Lancashire, Gent. Sept 5.
 Jephson, Manchester
 Parkinson, William, Dryolenden, Lancashire, Manufacturer. Aug 30.
 Heath and Sons, Manchester
 Robinson, Bersey, Elterwater Hill, Garsener, Westmorland, Widow.
 Sept 1. Harrison and Son, Kendal
 Roddy, William, Uxbridge, Middlesex, Draper. Sept 1. Woods and
 C, Uxbridge
 Rohoff, Margaret, High st, Kingsland, Widow. Aug 1. Sharpe and
 Co, Bedford row
 Reesler, John, Newton, Dorsetshire, Auctioneer. Aug 11. Boyt,
 Poole
 Tindall, James, Bonremouth, Hants, Esq. Sept 1. Moody and Co,
 Scarborough
 Toone, Francis Hastings, Portland place, Esq. Aug 5. Taylor and
 Sun, Field court, Gray's inn

Bankrupts.

FRIDAY, July 4, 1873.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar.
 To Surrender in London.

Bullin, Sarah, Duke st, Manchester square, Chemist. Pet July 2.
 Hazlitt. July 17 at 11
 Hart, Henry, Castle st, Houndditch. Pet July 3. Hazlitt. July 17
 at 12
 Jones, Charles, Fort rd, Bermondsey, Builder. Pet June 30. Brougham.
 July 16 at 12
 Lee, James, Thistle grove, West Brompton. Pet June 20. Brougham.
 July 16 at 11

To Surrender in the Country.

Balme, William, Colne, Lancashire, Manufacturer. Pet June 30. Hartley.
 Barmley, July 16 at 3.30
 Brown, Herbert Blackly, Gosport, Hants, Lieutenant. Pet June 30.
 Howard. Portsmouth, July 23 at 2

TUESDAY, July 8, 1873.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar.

To Surrender in London.

Bradhurst, James, Addington square, Camberwell, Common Brewer.
 Pet June 12. Roche. July 18 at 12
 Unisack, John Rochford, Strand, Publican. Pet July 4. Murray.
 July 24 at 12

To Surrender in the Country.

Baleock, James, Settle, Yorkshire, Draper. Pet July 4. Robinson.
 Bradford, July 22 at 12
 Gilliam, Ann, Leeds, Widow. Pet July 2. Marshall, Leeds, July 23
 at 11
 Bagreaves, William, Halifax, York, Butcher. Pet June 30. Rankin.
 Halifax, July 21 at 11
 Honeyman, John, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, no business. Pet July 3.
 Mortimer, Newcastle, July 19 at 12
 Simons, Joseph, Bristol, Inn Keeper. Pet July 3. Harley. Bristol,
 July 28 at 12
 Woodcock, James, Marsh Mill, Yorkshire, Ironfounder. Pet July 3.
 Nelson. Dewsbury, July 24 at 3

BANKRUPTCIES ANNULLED.

FRIDAY, July 4, 1873.

Nokes, Walter Federeau, and George Carlisle, Finch lane, Solicitors.
 July 2
 Hopkins, Louisa, Leighton, Buzzard, Bedfordshire, Butcher. June 26
 Young, Samuel, Salford, Lancashire, Beer Retailer. July 2

Deeds Registered under the Bankruptcy Act, 1861.

TUESDAY, July 8, 1873.

Lyster, William Ouseley, St Mary's terrace, Paddington, Clerk. Feb
 12. Composition. July 3 at 2

Liquidation by Arrangement.

FIRST MEETINGS OF CREDITORS.

TUESDAY, July 1, 1873.

Adler, George, Carmarthen, Eating house Keeper. July 11 at 11 a
 offices of Evans, Queen st, Carmarthen
 Andrews, Alfred, Northampton, Shoe Manufacturer. July 12 at 2 att
 offices of Roche, St Giles st, Northampton
 Benjamin, Henry, Houndditch, Bohemian Glass Merchant. July 17
 at 3 at 4, Bishopsgate st Without. Brighton

Blackburn, Edwin, Doncaster, Yorkshire, Gent. July 11 at 12 at
 offices of Tattershall, Queen st, Sheffield
 Carr, John, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Oil Merchant. July 10 at 12 at
 offices of McDonald, Mosley st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
 Carr, Walter Peterson, Elgin rd, Malda Vets, Chemist. July 16 at 3
 at offices of Minton and Co, Carey lane, General Post Office. Weeks
 and Son, Newgate st
 Carter, Frederick William, Philpot lane, Tea Broker. July 22 at 3 at
 offices of Flew and Irvine, Mark lane
 Chapman, George, East Retford, Nottinghamshire, Saddler. July 21 at
 12 at offices of Mee and Co, Church gate, East Retford
 Chapman, William, Colchester, Essex, Cab Proprietor. July 16 at 4
 at the Fleece Hotel, Head st, Colchester. Philbrick and Son, Col-
 chester
 Clarke, David, Lincoln, Baker. July 15 at 11 at offices of Toynbee and
 Larken, Bank st, Lincoln
 Crase, Thomas, Liverpool, Fish Dealer. July 15 at 3 at offices of
 Smith, Corri's building, Treason's row, Liverpool
 Crich, Charles Frederick, Leamington Priors, Warwickshire, Jeweller.
 July 14 at 12 at offices of Passman, Lower Belford st, Leamington
 Davidson, John Hector, Ramsgate, Kent, Wholesale Ironmonger. July
 22 at 12 at the Goldhill Coffee House, Gresham st. Trehera and
 Wolferstan, Ironmonger lane
 Dawson, Harriet, Sarah, Gloucester, Milliner. July 14 at 2 at offices of
 Mathews, Great Winchester st buildings. Burrup and Coren, Glou-
 cester
 Duckett, Frederick George, Gantonbury, Somersetshire, Railway Clerk.
 July 17 at 12 at offices of Bulleid, High st, Glastonbury
 Edney, George, Littlehampton, Sussex, Grocer. July 17 at 1 at the
 Dolls's Chop House Tavern, Queen's Head passage, Newgate st.
 Luckett, Littlehampton
 Felstead, Sumner Ernest, Wimborne Minster, Dorsetshire, Linen
 Draper. July 14 at 11 at the Crown Inn, Wimborne Minster. Moore,
 Wimborne Minster
 Fowler, William Henry, Cannock, Staffordshire, Butcher. July 12 at 11
 at offices of Barrow, Queen st, Wolverhampton
 Grummett, George, Birmingham, Corn Broker. July 11 at 3 at offices
 of Jaques, Cherry st, Birmingham
 Hyde, Charles, Birmingham, Cabinet Maker. July 10 at 3 at offices of
 Jaques, Cherry st, Birmingham
 Hardy, Hannah, Bradford, Yorkshire, Shopkeeper. July 12 at 10 at
 offices of Berry and Robinson, Charles st, Bradford
 Harper, James Bailie, Leamington Priors, Warwickshire, out of
 business. July 18 at 12 at the Globe Hotel, Warwick. Heap
 Hart, Henry, New Bond st, Berlin Worker. July 9 at 2 at offices of
 Taylor, O d Burlington st
 Hartley, William, Chester, Boot Maker. July 14 at 2 at office of Brook
 and Chapman, Walbrook house, Walbrook. Gibson, Sittingbourne
 Histed, John, Brighton, Sussex, Wine Merchant. July 16 at 2 at office
 of Lamb, Ship st, Brighton
 Holden, James Cawood, Liverpool st, King's Cross, Commission Agent.
 July 11 at 3 at offices of Vernede, Crown st, Strand
 Hoolihan, Daniel, Liverpool, Tallow Chandler. July 15 at 1 at the
 Clarendon Rooms, South John st Liverpool. McConnell, jun, Liver-
 pool
 Hughes, John Venables, Burslem, Staffordshire, Commission Agent.
 July 10 at 2 at offices of Lees, Waterloo rd, Burslem
 Ingham, William, Bishon Thornton, Yorkshire, Farmer. July 11 at 12
 at the George Hotel, Harrogate. Barr and Co
 Johnson, Edward, Wyland avenue, Hackney, Dealer in Music. July
 14 at 11 at 157, So thegate rd, Islington
 Johnson, Edwin, Birkenhead, Chester, Provender Dealer. July 15 at 3
 at offices of Thompson and Son, Hamilton square, Birkenhead
 Lavers, William, Church place, Grove st, Hicton, Builder. July 17
 at 12 at offices of Foreman and Cooper, Gresham st.
 Lucas, James Moore, Usk, Monmouth, Builder. July 14 at 10 at the
 Bath Hotel, Leamington. Gardner
 Mason, Francis, Bridport, Dorsetshire, Wine Merchant. July 24 at 11
 at offices of Day, West Allington, Bridport
 McCoy, George, Liverpool, Hardware Merchant. July 21 at 2 at the
 Law Association Rooms, Cook st, Liverpool. Copeman, Liverpool
 Milward, Thomas, Birmingham, Tea Dealer. July 16 at 3 at offices of
 Wright and Marshall, Townhall chambers, New st, Birmingham
 Moore, George, New Swindon, Wilts, Baker. July 14 at 11 at office of
 Kinneir and Tombs, High st, Swindon
 Morris, Samuel, Earls Barton, Northamptonshire, Shoe Manufacturer.
 July 19 at 2 at offices of Rands, Newland, Northampton
 Newton, John, and Thomas James Chapman, Leighton Buzzard, Bed-
 ford, Corn Merchants. July 8 at 2 at the Inns of Court Hotel, High
 Holborn. Cave, Market Harborough
 Nottingham, William, Whittlesley, Cambridgeshire, Innkeeper. July
 11 at 12 at the Queen's Head Inn, Whittlesley. Traves, Whittlesley
 Overshott, Thomas, Henry st, Hampstead rd, Fishmonger. July 14 at
 2 at offices of Walls, Walbrook
 Parfitt, Henry, King's Heath, Worcestershire, out of business. July 15
 at 3 at offices of Wright and Marshall, Townhall chambers, New st,
 Birmingham
 Parkinson, David, Farsley, Yorkshire, Dyer. July 12 at 12 at offices of
 Pullan, Bank chambers, Park row, Leeds
 Parry, William, Liverpool, Builder. July 11 at 11 at offices of Killey,
 Lord st, Liverpool
 Parsonage, Thomas, Rheslanerchrugog, Denbighshire, Grocer. July
 14 at 3 at offices of Nordou, Bridge at row East, Chester
 Puhl, Charles Ernest Gustavus Adolphus, Baddeley, Saltborton, Devon-
 shire, Gent. July 14 at 12 at the Bade Haven Hotel, Sidwell st,
 Exeter. Flood, Exeter
 Purser, Edward, Great Malvern, Worcestershire, Grocer. July 10 at
 11 at offices of Corbett, Avenus House, The Cross, Worcester, Cawley,
 Great Malvern
 Rackliff, Henry, Acton, Middlesex, Farrier. July 15 at 3 at offices of
 Poncione, jun, Moorgate st
 Roberts, Richard, Llanbadarnfawr, Cardigan, Butcher. July 9 at 11 at
 offices of Hughes and Son, North Parade, Abergystwith
 Scott, Thomas, Farnville rd, Marble Merchant. July 14 at 3 at office
 of Lorett, King William st, London bridge
 Shaw, James, Bradford, Iron Furniture Dealer. July 14 at 3 at offices
 of Green, Aldermanbury, Bradford

Smith, Joe, Wath-upon-Dearne, Yorkshire, Chemist. July 14 at 12 at offices of Harrop, Westgate, Rotherham
 Smith, John, jun, Birmingham, Grocer. July 9 at 3 at office of Fitter, Bennett's hill, Birmingham
 Stephenson, Edward, John st, Bedford row, Commission Agent. July 14 at 4 at offices of Eley, New Broad st
 Stirr, Samuel, Jan, Wolverhampton, Staffordshire, Grocer. July 12 at 1 at offices of Barrow, Queen st, Wolverhampton
 Soare, Henry, Warwick crescent, Paddington, Reporter's Clerk. July 12 at 10.30 at offices of Attenborough, St Paul's church yard
 Suckling, Henry Welch, and Henry Ormrod, Birmingham, Auctioneers. July 14 at 11 at offices of Sharp, Argyle chambers, Colmore row, Birmingham. Nicholls, Birmingham
 Tilley, John, Cheltenham, Gloucestershire, Corn Dealer. July 12 at 1 at offices of Marshall, Essex place, Cheltenham
 Turner, Richard Hudson, Wigan, Lancashire, Book keeper. July 17 at 3 at offices of Forshaw, Cannon st, Preston
 Wall, James, Stretton Surwaa, Herefordshire, Builder. July 14 at 1 at offices of Corner, High Town, Hereford
 Well, Louis, Little Aile st, Goodman's fields, Boot Manufacturer. July 22 at 3 at offices of Lewis and Lewis, Ely place, Holborn
 Wilkinson, Hubert Henry Birkett, and James Edmond Long, Parkgate, near Rotherham, Yorkshire, Doctors. July 9 at 12 at the Ship Hotel, Rotherham. Marsh
 Willis, Johnson Thomas, and Frederic Master Willis, Luton, Bedfordshire, Straw Hat Manufacturers. July 17 at 2 at 145, Cheapside. Hooks and Co, King st, Cheapside
 Wright, George, Bush lane, Tea Dealer. July 11 at 2 at offices of Standing, Eastcheap
 Wright, Thomas, Manchester, Plumber. July 18 at 4 at office of Best, Brown st, Manchester

FRIDAY, July 4, 1873.

Aston, Edwin, Bloxwich, Staffordshire, Commercial Clerk. July 18 at 11 at offices of Baker, Bridge st, Walsall
 Barker, William, Alford, Lincolnshire, Cabinet Maker. July 18 at 4 at offices of Mason, Market place, Alford
 Bennett, George, Pritchard rd, Hackney rd, Pork Butcher. July 23 at 12 at offices of Willis, Charles square, Hoxton
 Blackburn, Henry, Southport, Lancashire, out of business. July 21 at 12 at offices of Fowler and Carruthers, Clayton square, Liverpool
 Byrne, Jane, Manchester, Dressmaker. July 18 at 3 at offices of Nicholson and Milne, Norfolk st, Manchester. Fletcher, Bacup
 Bradshaw, John Hales, Great Weldon, Northamptonshire, Plumber. July 17 at 11 at offices of Richardson and Son, Oundle
 Bradshaw, Thomas, Leppington, Yorkshire, Farmer. July 11 at 11 at offices of Walker and Langbourne, Malton
 Brammer, Thomas, Hanley, Staffordshire, Potter. July 16 at 3 at the Seyd Arms Hotel, Tunstall. Llewellyn and Co, Tunstall
 Brooks, George Fry, Glastonbury, Somersetshire, Legging Manufacturer. July 22 at 11 at the Guildhall Coffee house, Gresham st. Bullard, Glastonbury
 Brown, George, sen, and George Brown, jun, Dewsbury, Yorkshire, Boot Dealers. July 18 at 3 at offices of Birtwhistle, Crown st, Halifax. Rotherham, Dewsbury
 Brown, James, Sheffield, Cutlery Manufacturer. July 14 at 4 at offices of Simsey and Son, Queen st chambers, Sheffield
 Bryant, George, Aldergate st, no occupation. July 11 at 2 at office of Simmons, Chancery chambers, Quality court, Chancery lane. King
 Buvelot, Edmond, Billiter st, Leather Factor. July 17 at 2 at offices of Brandon, Essex at, Strand
 Cawless, Anne, Bristol, Dressmaker. July 17 at 11 at offices of Brittan and sons, Albion chambers, Bristol
 Clifford, James, Ashford, Kent, Builder. July 15 at 2 at the Saracen's Head Hotel, Ashford. Hallett and Co, Ashford
 Cockcroft, John, North Ormsby, Yorkshire, Grocer. July 16 at 3 at offices of Addenbrooke, Zealand rd, Middlesborough
 Dalgleish, Walter James, Warwick lane, Newgate st, Stationer. July 16 at 12 at 18, New City chambers, Bishopsgate st Within. Guscott
 Daniel, Edward, Newport, Monmouth, Manure Merchant. July 16 at 3 at the Queen's Hotel, Bridge st, Newport. Beckingham, Bristol
 De Bary, Charles William Rudolph, Fonthill rd, Finsbury Park, Manufacturing Chemist. July 21 at 2 at 33, Gutter lane. Plunkett, Gutter lane
 Dinham, William Henry, Huddersfield, Yorkshire, Wool Extractor. July 16 at 3 at offices of Heap and Co, Station st, Huddersfield
 Dodsworth, Richard George, Yorkshire, Innkeeper. July 17 at 11 at offices of Mann and Son, New st, York
 Fletcher, William, Liverpool, Tailor. July 17 at 11 at office of Killey, Lord st, Liverpool
 Franks, George, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Jeweller. July 16 at 2 at office of Joel, Newgate st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
 Froy, Thomas, Hitchin, Hertford, Publican. July 7 at 3 at the Old George Inn, Hitchin. Wiles, Hoxton
 Gates, John (and not Yates, as erroneously printed in the Gazette of 27th ultmo), Heyworth, Suffolk, Farmer. July 16 at 11 at the Guildhall, Bury St Edmunds. Salmon and Son
 Grant, William Gow, Leeds, Draper. July 14 at 3 at office of Fawcett and Malcolm, Park row, Leeds
 Hare, John, and Frederick Charles Ralph, Gill's yard, Hampstead rd, Japanned Furniture Manufacturers. July 21 at 2 at offices of Pinwill, Pinners hall, Old Broad st
 Harris, James George, Bristol, Baker. July 17 at 12.30 at offices of Williams and Co, Exchange Bristol. Fussell and Co, Bristol
 Herring, Daniel, Norwich, Grocer. July 16 at 11 at offices of Tillott, St Andrew's st Norwich
 Hill, William Edward, High st, Deptford, House Decorator. July 14 at 1 at offices of Moss and Son, Gracechurch st
 Hoare, William, Lawrence Postney place, Macclesfield. July 22 at 2 at offices of Waddell and Co, Poultry. Lyne and Holman, Austin friars
 Horfall, George, Shipley, Yorkshire, Builder. July 17 at 2 at the Victoria Hotel, Bradford. Waker, Dewsbury
 Huntington, Thomas, Liverpool, Corn Dealer. July 25 at 12 at offices of Ford, The Temple, Liverpool. Meadows, Liverpool
 Isaac, David Evan, Swansea, Glamorganshire, House Furnisher. July 18 at 11 at offices of Barnard and Co, Temple st, Swansea. Beer, Swansea

Johnson, John Rendle, Exmouth, Devonshire, General Shop Keeper. July 17 at 2 at offices of Friend, Post Office chambers, Exeter
 Kendall, Nathaniel William, Brighton, Sussex, Painter. July 22 at 3 at offices of Hamilton, Prince Albert st, Brighton
 Leyberg, Barnett, Chesham, Manchester, General Dealer. July 21 at 11 at office of Rylance, Essex st, Manchester
 Lill, Edward, Manchester, Chemist. July 16 at 3 at office of Hard-lars and Co, Princess st, Manchester
 Martin, Edward, St Alban's, Hertfordshire, Grocer. July 18 at 12 at offices of Carter and Bell, Leadenhall st
 Miller, John Austin, Brunswick square, Stock Dealer. July 17 at 5 at offices of Izard and Betts, Eastcheap. Aird, Eastcheap
 O'Connor, Arthur, and William Henry O'Connor, Berners st, Oxford st, Artists in Stained Glass Painting. July 17 at 3 at 4, Berners st. Barrett, Bell yard, Doctor's commons
 Payne, Henry William, Southampton, Boat Builder. July 15 at 2 at office of Robins, Portland st, Southampton
 Pearson, John, Louth, Lincolnshire, Miller. July 18 at 3 at office of Mason and Falkner, Eastgate, Louth
 Phillips, Henry John, Chigwell, Essex, Hay Dealer. July 22 at 2 at offices of Oliver, King st, Cheapside
 Podd, Walter, Lowestoft, Suffolk, Builder. July 22 at 12 at offices of Seago, High st, Lowestoft
 Poole, William, Blackpool, Lancashire, Chemist. July 17 at 11 at offices of Fryer, Lune st, Preston
 Pye, William, Lowestoft, Suffolk, Fish Curer. July 23 at 12 at offices of Archer, London rd, Lowestoft
 Sawyer, William, and Thomas Barker, Hastings, Sussex, Mineral Water Manufacturers. July 17 at 1 at offices of Savory, Trinity st, Hastings
 Scott, George, Sa'ford, Lancashire, Horsekeeper. July 21 at 3 at offices of Rylance, Essex st, Manchester
 Schofield, Richard Walker, Workington, Cumberland, Builder. July 18 at 1 at the Savings' Bank, Workington. Hayton and Simpson, Cockermouth
 Slade, George, Southampton, Butcher. July 16 at 12 at the Royal Hotel, Abore Bar, Southampton. Green and Moberly, Southampton
 Stevens, John, Chiswick, Middlesex, Grocer. July 21 at 1 at offices of Smith, Church court, Clement's lane
 Stickle, Thomas, Birmingham, Horse Dealer. July 15 at 12 at offices of Fallows, Cherry st, Birmingham
 Surlett, Thomas, Packington st, Islington, Grocer. July 15 at 2 at the Guildhall Coffee House, Boulton, Northampton square, Clerkenwell
 Taylor, William, St Swinich's lane, Commission Agent. July 28 at 2 at the Masons' Hall Tavern, Masons' avenue, Basinghall st. Brown, Basinghall st
 Thornton, James Webster, Fartown, Pudsey, Yorkshire, Joiner. July 17 at 3 at offices of Carr, Albion st, Leeds
 Threadgill, Jacob, Dewsbury, Yorkshire, Upholsterer. July 22 at 10.30 at offices of Scholes and Son, Leeds rd, Dewsbury
 Trott, Thomas James, Bristol, Cab Proprietor. July 15 at 2 at office of Beal, Bealham, Albion chambers, Bristol
 Violet, Thomas, Hackford row, North Brixton, Grocer. July 21 at 2 at offices of Blackford and Riches, Great Swan alley, Moorgate st
 Walker, Hugh, Colby terrace, Gipsy Hill, Upper Norwood, Baker. July 14 at 3 at office of Cooper, Charing cross
 Warburton, William, Ince, near Wigan, Lancashire, Shopkeeper. July 21 at 3 at offices of Hawett, King st, Wigan
 Wise, Stanley Leopold, Hastings, Sussex, Pianoforte Seller. July 21 at 3 at offices of Howell, Cheapside
 Woodman, Joseph, High st, St John's Wood, Gasfitter. July 18 at 1 at offices of Orchard, John st, Bedford row
 Wright, Solomon, Bradford, Yorkshire, Commission Agent. July 15 at 3 at offices of Lees and Co, New Ivegate, Bradford

TUESDAY, July 8, 1873.

Adams, Henry, High st, Marylebone, Leather Seller. July 17 at 11 at offices of Kent and Co, Basinghall st. New, Basinghall st
 Arnold, James, Andover rd, Hammersmith, Boot Maker. July 19 at 11 at offices of Calverley, Warwick House, Shepherd's Bush
 Barnes, Edward, Sheffield, Labourer. July 19 at 3 at office of Freeman, Pitt st, Barnley
 Batchelor, Thomas, Lee Common, Bucks, Farmer. July 30 at 2 at the Red Lion Hotel, Great Missenden. Clarke, High Wycombe
 Bell, William, Bradford, Yorkshire, Chemist. July 24 at 3 at offices of Atkinson, Tyrell st, Bradford
 Borden, Thomas Joseph Clarence Linden, Gracechurch st, Accountant. July 17 at 10.30 at offices of Lee, Chancery lane
 Bosson, William Frederick, Hastings, Sussex, Plumber. July 24 at 1 at the Guildhall Tavern, Gresham st. Langham, Hastings
 Bradbury, John Robert, Hunslett, Leeds, Plumber. July 21 at 11 at offices of Markland and Davy, Albion st, Leeds
 Brooke, Reuben, Crewe, Cheshire, Builder. July 23 at 10.30 at the Royal Hotel, Nantwich rd, Crewe. Cooke, Middlewich
 Brooks, John, Hanover st, Walworth rd, Builder. July 17 at 12 at office of Field, Furnival's inn
 Burden, John Walton, Leicester, out of business. July 22 at 12 at office of Fowler and Co, Hotel st, Leicester
 Burgess, Rev Henry Martyn, Filby, Norfolk. July 23 at 12 at offices of Blake, Hall Quay chambers, Great Yarmouth. Palmer, Great Yarmouth
 Buswell, Edward, Leicester, Pasteboard Manufacturer. July 22 at 1 at offices of Owston, Friar lane, Leicester
 Carr, Frederick, Whittington terrace, Upper Holloway, Linen Draper. July 22 at 12 at offices of Minton and Co, Carey lane, General Post Office. Weeks and Son, Newgate st
 Carter, George, Feltham, Middlesex, Beer Retailer. July 29 at 3 at office of Cogswell, Gracechurch st. Hicks, Gracechurch st
 Carver, James Frederick, and Frederick Canaway Carver, Fulham rd, Ironmongers. July 23 at 3 at offices of Dod & Longstaffe, Berners st, Oxford st
 Claxton, Nathaniel, Warren st, Tottenham court rd, Embosser. July 26 at 3 at offices of Webster, Basinghall st. Popham, Vincent terrace, Islington
 Cousins, George, Leicester, Leather Factor. July 22 at 12 at offices of Harvey, Pocklington's walk, Leicester
 Day, Robert, Leicester, Boot Manufacturer. July 22 at 12 at offices of Owston, Friar lane, Leicester

Dix, Robert, Norwich, Boot Manufacturer. July 25 at 4 at offices of Sadd, Church at, Theatre st, Norwich

Eggar, Robert, Sheffield, Grocer. July 18 at 2 at office of Branson and Son, Bank st, Sheffield

Eynon, Thomas, Ocker hill, Staffordshire, Butcher. July 19 at 10 at offices of Barrow, Queen st, Wolverhampton

Galloway, Walter Road, Mount Pleasant rd, Crouch hill, Solicitor's Clerk. July 23 at 1 at offices of Kelley, Great James st, Bedford row

Garman, Robert, Heygate st, Walworth rd, Cab Proprietor. July 21 at 4 at offices of Beard and Son, Basinghall st

Gillard, Robert, Marylebone lane, Upholsterer. July 21 at 2 at office of Williams, Alfred place, Bedford square

Groombridge, Charles, and Richard Henry Groombridge, Paternoster row, Booksellers. July 24 at 3 at offices of Ladbury and Co, Cheap-side. Lewis & Lewis, Ely place

Hepworth, James, Shipley, Yorkshire, Railway Agent. July 23 at 3 at the Black Swan Inn, Thornton rd, Bradford

Hobby, Joseph, Ventnor, Isle of Wight, House Agent. July 30 at 3 at offices of Urry, High st, Ventnor

Holland, George, Sheffield, Tailor. July 23 at 12 at offices of Machen, Bank st, Sheffield

Holmes, William Edward, Crouch End, Hornsey, Watchmaker. July 15 at 3 at offices of Marshall, Lincoln's inn fields

Horrocks, John James, and Thomas Robertson Hellaby, Strand, Stationers. July 21 at 12 at the Guildhall Coffee house, Gresham st. Anderson and Sons, Ironmonger lane

Joyces, Edwin, Marchmont st, Butcher. Aug 1 at 3 at Adelphi house, Strand. Hicks and Arnold, Salisbury st, Strand

Knights, William, Henry Knight, and George Knight, Sheffield, Cutlery Manufacturers. July 18 at 11.30 at offices of Anty, Queen st, Sheffield

Ladd, William Henry, Birmingham, Carpenter. July 17 at 2 at offices of Ladbury, Newhall st, Birmingham

Langdon, Henry, Exmouth, Devon, Coal Merchant. July 11 at 3 at the Dolphin Hotel, Exmouth

Lewis, William, Cardiff, Glamorganshire, Printer. July 30 at 12 at office of Barnard and Co, Crookherb town, Cardiff. Waldron, Cardiff

Lewis, William, and John Williams, Cardiff, Glamorganshire, Printers. July 28 at 12 at offices of Nicholls and Leatherdale, Old Jewry chambers

Linton, Charles, New Wimbledon, Surrey, Grocer. July 23 at 3 at offices of Bath and Co, King William st

Longley, Thomas Roseville, Faversham, Kent, Plumber. July 31 at 2 at offices of Kipping, Essex st, Strand

Lord, Mary, and Joseph Lord, Leicester, Boot Makers. July 23 at 12 at office of Fowler and Co, Hotel st, Leicester

Lustain, Thomas Henry, Oldbury, Worcestershire, Grocer. July 21 at 12 at the Union Hotel, Union st, Birmingham. Shakespeare, Oldbury

Mansell, Thomas, Woodside terrace, Upper Norwood, Bookseller. July 15 at 2 at offices of Vernode, Craven st, Strand

Marshall, Robert, Towcester, Northamptonshire, Blacksmith. July 18 at 3 at offices of Becker, Market square, Northampton. Whitton, Towcester

McKee, Duncan Sinclair, Liverpool, Outfitter. July 21 at 3 at office of Barrall and Rodney, Lord st, Liverpool

Mells, James Shenn, City rd, out of business. July 15 at 3 at the Bridge House Hotel, Southwark. Chipperfield and Sturt, Trinity st, Southwark

Morrison, Daniel Jacob, Newington Butts, Hatter. July 17 at 4 at 145, Cheapside

Mounce, James, Buckland Brewer, Devonshire, Tailor. July 26 at 12 at offices of Rooker and Bazeley, Bridgeland st, Bideford

New Inman, Sheffield, Printer. July 18 at 4 at offices of Anty, Queen st, Sheffield

Pearson, Robert Banks, Wigan, Lancashire, Auctioneer. July 24 at 11 at offices of Byrom, King st, Wigan

Pritchard, Frederick William, Bristol, Butter Dealer. July 25 at 12 at offices of Benson, Broad st, Bristol

Ramsden, David, Leeds, Cabinet Maker. July 21 at 2 at offices of Granger, Bank st, Leeds

Rawlings, Charles Henry Paul, Landport, Hants, Timber Merchant. July 16 at 10 at offices of King, Union st, Portsea

Ray, Robert, Sale, Cheshire, Builder. July 18 at 3 at offices of Rowley and Co, Clarence buildings, Booth st, Manchester

Reynard, William, Wortley, Yorkshire, Blacksmith. July 18 at 3 at offices of Maud and Senior, Duncan st, Hargreaves

Richardson, James, and William Crabtree, Dewsbury, Yorkshire, Wool Dealers. July 21 at 3 at offices of Iberson, Dewsbury

Rowland, Benjamin, Cheltenham, Gloucestershire, Grocer. July 18 at 12 at offices of Smith, Regent st, Cheltenham

Russell, Johathan, Darkhouse lane, Billingsgate, Oyster Merchant. July 31 at 3 at offices of Langham and Son, Bartlett's buildings, Holborn

Salmons, William, Newport Pagnell, Bucks, Licensed Victualler. July 21 at 3 at the Swan Hotel, Newport Pagnell

Schmetzer, John, Clark's place, Hornsey rd, Baker. July 19 at 11 at 17, Great James st, Bedford row. Drawbridge

Shaw, William, Northampton, Oil Cake Manufacturer. July 18 at 11 at offices of Markham, Guildhall rd, Northampton

Staples, George, Salisbury, Wiltshire, Grocer. July 25 at 11 at offices of Hoddling, Salisbury

Stone, Matilda Catherine, Havretrie, Devon, Widow. July 23 at 2 at the Bude Haven Hotel, Exeter. Peyton

Storey, Thomas Richards, and Thomas Holland, Bond court House, Walbrook, Brassfounders. July 18 at 1 at 145, Cheapside. Wickens, Palmerston buildings, Old Broad st

Thomas, John Bryer, Brunswick place, East rd, City rd, Oilman. July 16 at 3 at offices of Webster, Basinghall st

Tomson, James Samuel William, Golden lane, Barbican, Fancy Box Manufacturer. July 24 at 2 at office of Cooper, Charing cross

Vargart, Benjamin, Star and Garter yard, Upper North st, Caledonian rd, Dealer in Milk. July 17 at 2 at offices of Bohm, New Inn, Strand

Weston, Henry Plantagenet, Brighton, Gent. July 23 at 12 at offices of Smith and Co, Broad st, Cheapside. Lamb, Ship st, Brighton

Williams, John, Canton, near Cardiff, Glamorganshire, Printer. July 30 at 12 at offices of Barnard and Co, Crookherb town, Cardiff. Waldron, Cardiff

Willis, James, Bradford, Yorkshire, Machine Broker. July 21 at 3 at offices of Dennotto, Tyrral st, Bradford

Woodcock, Winton, Sheffield, Saddler. July 21 at 3 at offices of Tattershall, Meeting House lane, Sheffield

Kensington High-street Improvements.—To Capitalists and Trustees. —Freehold Ground-rents, amounting to nearly £3,400 per annum, abundantly secured on handsome, newly-built houses, with shops, a public-house, stabling, &c., with reversion to the rack rents, at present estimated at about £10,000 per annum. This property consists of the fine estate created by the Metropolitan Board under their powers for widening the high road at this spot.

MESSRS. FOSTER respectfully announce for SALE BY AUCTION, at the AUCTION MART, Tokenhouse-yard, Lothbury, near the Bank of England, on MONDAY, the 21st JULY, at ONE o'clock precisely, in Lots, by direction of the Metropolitan Board of Works, an exceedingly valuable FREEHOLD ESTATE of FIFTY-SIX substantial newly-built HOUSES, with shops, stabling, &c., being the entire block (or nearly so) of first-class houses, shop, and public-house property, on the south side of the High-street, opposite the new Parish Church of St. Mary Abbots, Kensington, bounded by and including the new houses in Young-street and King-street, and those at the back in Ball-street, with ranges of stabling in Borden-mews, subject to building leases, producing from ground-rents a clear income of £2,370 per annum, but of the estimated rent value of about £10,000 per annum. Probably no improvement in or about London was more needed than the widening of that formerly dangerously narrow part of the Court suburb and main western highway to and from the metropolis, and no improvement has been more conducive to the public convenience and the advantage of a locality. The noble shops which form the frontage at this spot attest its commercial importance and popularity, hence the more than usual abundant security of these ground-rents. For the convenience of purchasers each lease will form a separate lot. Messrs. Foster think it superfluous to say aught in recommendation of these freehold ground-rents, as no class of investment is more secure or capable of yielding a more certain income, whilst no others have such prospective advantages.

Particulars, with plans, will shortly be published and may then be had, gratis, at the Auction Mart; at the office of the Metropolitan Board of Works, Spring-gardens; or of Messrs. FOSTER, 54, Pall-mall, who will forward the same on application.

Periodical Sales.

MR. MARSH begs to announce that his PERIODICAL SALES (established in 1843) for the Disposal of Reversions, Absolutes and Contingent, Life Interests and Annuities, Policies of Life Assurance, Shares in all public undertakings, Advowsons and next presentations, manorial rights, and tithe rents charges, are APPOINTED to TAKE PLACE on the first Thursday in each month throughout the present year, as under:—

July 17th.	Sept. 4th.	Nov. 6th.
Aug. 3rd.	Oct. 2d.	Dec. 4th.

Also that the following days are appropriated during the present year for the sale of Freehold Estates, town or country Mansions, Copyhold and Leasehold Properties, suburban and town Residences, Freehold and Leasehold Ground-rents, and every description of real property:—

July 10th, 17th, 24th, and 31st.	October 16th and 23rd.
August 14th, and 31st.	November 20th and 27th.
September 18th and 25th.	December 11th and 18th.

Auction, land and estate agency offices, 54, Cannon-street, E.C.

Surbiton-hill.—A first-class Freehold Residence (one of the best in the neighbourhood), built by the present proprietor nine years since for his own occupation, and occupying a good position on the summit of the hill, near the church, five minutes' walk from the station. It contains 11 bed-rooms, dressing-rooms, bath-room, outer and inner halls, drawing-room 25ft. 6in. by 17ft. 6in., dining-room 28ft. 6in. by 17ft., billiard-room 28ft. by 17ft. 6in., morning-room 17ft. 6in. by 13ft., library, large conservatory, servants' hall, cellarage, and good offices; stabling for three horses and a pony, coach-house for four carriages, three dwelling rooms over, vinery, peach-house in three compartments, second vinery, croquet lawn, with raised banks and shrubberies surrounding same, sloping lawns, flower beds, fruit and vegetable gardens, and piece of land adjoining; in all about an acre.

MESSRS. DEBENHAM, TEWSON & FARMER have been instructed by the resident owner (who is about to leave the neighbourhood) to SELL the above-mentioned PROPERTY at the MART, City, on TUESDAY, JULY 15, at TWO (unless previously disposed of by private contract). Possession will be given on completion of the purchase.

Particulars of W. J. MEYMOTT, Esq., Solicitor, 83, Blackfriars-road; and of the Auctioneers, 80, Cheapside, City.

MESSRS. DEBENHAM, TEWSON & FARMER'S LIST of ESTATES and HOUSES to be SOLD or LET, including Landed Estates, Town and Country Residences, Hunting and Shooting Quarters, Farms, Ground Rents, Rent Charges, House Property and Investments generally, is published on the first day of each month, and may be obtained, free of charge, at their offices, 80, Cheapside, E.C., or will be sent by post in return for two stamps.—Particulars for insertion should be received not later than four days previous to the end of the preceding month.

EXECUTORS and TRUSTEES, having SILVER, PLATE, WATCHES, Jewellery, China, Glass, Reliquaries, Bronzes, Books, Wearing Apparel, Merchandise, Trade Stocks, &c., &c., to DISPOSE OF, will find the "West-end Auction Mart" the best medium for realising, it being centrally situated, and replete with every convenience for the better display of property. Advances prior to sales. Valuations made for all purposes.—W. HICKINATHAM & SONS, Proprietors, 8 and 9, Upper St. Martin's-lane, W.C.

Now ready, in 1 thick vol., 8vo, price 30s., cloth.

THE LAW AND PRACTICE IN BANKRUPTCY :
comprising the Bankruptcy Act, 1869; the Debtors Act, 1869; the Insolvent Debtors and Bankruptcy Repeal Act, 1869, and the subsequent Acts; together with the General Rules and Orders in Bankruptcy and at Common Law. With the Practice on Procedure, copious Notes, References, and a very Elaborate and Exhaustive Index. Second Edition, greatly enlarged, with numerous additional Cases, Statutes, Forms, &c., &c. By HENRY PHILIP ROCHE, Esq., of Lincoln's Inn, and WILLIAM HAZLITT, Esq., of the Middle Temple, Barristers-at-Law, and Registrars of the Court of Bankruptcy.

Now ready, in 8vo, price 5s., cloth.

A CONCISE VIEW OF THE LAW RELATING TO
PRIORITY OF INCUMBRANCES, and of other Rights of Property. By W. G. ROBINSON, of the Middle Temple, Barrister-at-Law. London: STEVENS & HAYNES, Bell-yard, Temple-bar, W.C.

Just published, royal 8vo, cloth, lettered, 5s.; paper covers, 4s.

WITH THE SANCTION OF THE REGISTRAR-GENERAL.

DIGEST OF THE ENGLISH CENSUS OF 1871.

Compiled from the Official Returns and edited by JAMES LEWIS (of the Registrar General's Department, Somerset House). Dedicated by permission to the President, Vice-Presidents, and Council of the Statistical Society of London.

"A comprehensive Digest, which in the compass of about 200 octavo pages, contains all the leading features of the official folios. . . . Mr. Lewis, who has himself taken an important part in the preparation of the folios, is particularly well qualified for the task which he has achieved. He has written an introduction which is, in fact, a Report on the Census, so far as its results have as yet been ascertained; and his work contains everything on the subject that most people will desire to know, in a form at once clear, easy of reference, and convenient to handle. . . . The introduction contains many original features among which may be mentioned the observations on the movements of the English Population, the sections on Inhabited Houses, on Urban and Rural Populations, on Parliamentary Representation, on Urban Sanitary Districts, on the Growth of London, and on the cost of the Census, together with the application throughout of the facts derived from the Returns of 1871. . . . Our limits forbid us at present to dig more deeply into the rich mine of figures which Mr. Lewis has marshalled so conveniently; and we can only pay a parting tribute to the design and execution of his volume, and to the service which it will render to all who are called upon to make use of the facts which it contains."—Times.

London: EDWARD STANFORD, 6 and 7, Charing-cross, S.W.

Third Edition,

CRACROFT'S INVESTORS' and SOLICITORS' MEMORANDUM BOOK OF PURCHASES and SALES, with CALCULATIONS Adapted to Every Investment. An additional portion especially adapted for the Legal Profession, containing Forms of Entry for Freehold and Copyhold Property; Leasehold, Let and Held; Mortgages, Held and Effected; Insurances; Bills and Promissory Notes; Moneys Advanced or Borrowed.

"The object of this Memorandum Book is to enable every Investor to keep a systematic Record, producible in a Court of Law, of every investment transaction entered into. No such record was in existence previous to the first edition."

Second Edition,

CRACROFT'S "CONSOLS CHART," showing the Highest and Lowest Prices of Three per Cent. Consols each year from the French Revolution of 1789 to the Present Time, with the Growth and Decline of the National Funded Debt of Great Britain; the Yearly Average of the Bank Rate of Discount, and Tabulated Statement of the Principal Events Affecting the Prices of Stocks.

"Diagrams are sometimes not very simple, but the present one is clearness itself—is an interesting commentary on English history for the period in question."—Economist.

Price 2s.; or, mounted on roller, 3s. 6d.

London: EDWARD STANFORD, Charing-cross.

BERNARD CRACROFT, Stock and Share Broker, 5, Austin-friars, E.C.

Now ready,

CRACROFT'S INVESTMENT TRACTS.

A AMERICAN RAILWAYS as INVESTMENTS
By ROBERT GIFFEN.

London: EDWARD STANFORD, Charing-cross.

The Companies Acts, 1862 & 1867.

Every requisite under the above Acts supplied on the shortest notice

The BOOKS AND FORMS kept in stock for immediate use. MEMORANDA AND ARTICLES OF ASSOCIATION speedily printed in the proper form for registration and distribution. SHARE CERTIFICATES, DEBENTURES, &c., engraved and printed. OFFICIAL SEALS designed and executed. No charge for sketches. Companies Fee Stamps. Railway Registration Forms.

Solicitors' Account Books.

ASH & FLINT,

Stationers, Printers, Engravers, Registration Agents, &c., 49, Fleet-street, London, E.C. (corner of Serjeants'-inn).

NOW READY.

CRACROFT'S INVESTMENT TRACTS.

CRACROFT'S TRUSTEES' GUIDE.

Being a Synopsis of the Powers of Investment ordinarily given to Trustees, with General Directions and Tables of Securities.

PRICE ONE SHILLING.

PREFACE.

The difficulty experienced by Trustees in ascertaining the scope of their powers of investment, and the securities of which they may prudently avail themselves, have induced me to prepare this publication; nor can I doubt that a practical and concise guide in plain words will be indulgently accepted by the public. The Tables of Securities have been made as complete as possible, with the view of rendering them useful to everyone—Trustees or otherwise. No pains have been spared to test the accuracy of the information afforded, although it has been considered unnecessary to encumber the book with references to Authorities, Acts of Parliament excepted.

BERNARD CRACROFT.

Stock and Share Broker,
5, Austin-friars, London.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	Page
Of Powers of Investment	5
Section 1.—Of Investments by Trustees under Instruments which do not name the Securities to be employed	6
Section 2.—Of Investments by Trustees under Instruments which name the Securities to be employed	7
Section 3.—Corporations and Trustees holding money in Trust for any Public or Charitable purpose	8
As to Forms of Powers of Investment	9
General Directions	11
The Retirement of Trustees	13

APPENDIX.

PART I.

Statutory and other Investments	19
Colonial Government Securities	23
Foreign Government Securities	29
United States Government, State, and Municipal Loans	39
Railways, British—Ordinary Stocks and Shares	43
— — — Preference Stocks and Shares	49
— — — Preference Stocks and Shares, with Dividend's Contingent on Profits	55
— — — Lines Leased at Fixed Rentals	61
— — — Debenture Stocks and Shares	67
Railways, British Possessions—Ordinary Preference and Debenture Capital	71
— — — Indian — Debentures and Debenture Stocks	77
— — — American — Bonds, Shares, &c.	81
— — — Foreign — Ordinary Capital	87
— — — Obligations (Preferences and Debentures)	93

PART II.

Banking Companies	100
Financial	108
Land	110
Insurance	112
Gas	116
Waterworks	120
Canal, Dock, and Shipping Companies	123
Engineering and Colliery Companies	124
Tramway	126
Telegraph and Construction	128
Miscellaneous Companies	130
Miscellaneous Bonds	132
Miscellaneous Bonds	134
Stamp Duties	137

EDWARD STANFORD, Charing Cross, London.

YATES & ALEXANDER,
PRINTERS, LITHOGRAPHERS, STATIONERS,
ETC.

SYMONDS INN, 22, CHANCERY-LANE,
LONDON.

Every description of Printing.

Chancery Bills and Answers	Catalogues
Appeals	Prospectuses
Parliamentary Minutes	Magazines
Books	Newspapers
Pamphlets	Circulars
Reports	Posters
Rules	Handbills, &c., &c.

LIEBIG COMPANY'S EXTRACT OF MEAT.

None genuine without the Inventor's facsimile in blue being on the Trade-mark label and outer cover. Pure condensed Essence of Beef Tea, excellent economic flavoured stock for soups, sauces, and made dishes.

"Food for the nerves." (Liebig.)